arXiv:1201.6247v2 [math-ph] 8 Jun 2012

ANDERSON LOCALIZATION
FOR A MULTI-PARTICLE QUANTUM GRAPH

MOSTAFA SABRI

Abstract. We study a multi-particle quantum graph with random potential. Taking the approach of multiscale analysis we prove exponential and strong dynamical localization of any order in the Hilbert-Schmidt norm near the spectral edge. Apart from the results on multi-particle systems, we also prove Lifshitz-type asymptotics for single-particle systems. This shows in particular that localization for single-particle quantum graphs holds under a weaker assumption on the random potential than previously known.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Multi-particle Quantum Graphs 3
3. Finite-Volume Operators and Cubes Geometry 5
4. Combes-Thomas estimate 9
5. Geometric Resolvent Inequalities 11
6. Wegner Estimates 15
7. Initial Length Scale Estimate 18
8. Multi-Particle Multiscale Analysis 20
9. Generalized Eigenfunctions 30
10. Exponential Localization 33
11. Dynamical Localization 36
12. Appendix 38
References 42

1. Introduction

In this article we study localization properties of multi-particle Anderson Hamiltonians on quantum graphs. A quantum graph is roughly speaking a pair (Γ, H), where Γ is a network on which a Schrödinger operator H acts. Γ is usually regarded as a collection of vertices and edges, or as a singular one-dimensional manifold. While the term "quantum graph" seems to have been introduced quite recently in the mathematical literature, the study of differential equations on networks actually goes back at least to the early 1980s, see [32] for a review. Here we focus on the spectral analysis of random quantum graphs. A series of results were obtained for single-particle quantum graphs over $\mathbb{Z}^d$, where localization near the spectral edge was established for a random potential model in [12], for a random

---

Date: June 8, 2012.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 82B44. Secondary 47B80, 34B45.

Key words and phrases. Anderson localization, random operators, multi-particle, quantum graphs.

vertex coupling model in [22], and for a random edge length model in [23]. Related questions were also considered for random quantum tree graphs, see [2] and [19].

The configuration space of an N-particle system in which each particle lives in a quantum graph Γ is no longer a usual metric graph composed of vertices and edges (if $N > 1$). Indeed, to study the interaction between 2 particles, one lying on an edge e_1 and the other lying on an edge e_2, we have to consider the edge pair (e_1, e_2). We are thus led to consider a certain cartesian product of two quantum graphs, which may be regarded as a two-dimensional network of squares (or rectangles). The first systematic study of boundary value problems on two-dimensional polygonal networks probably appeared in the works of Nicaise, see [30]. We also record the recent preprint [5] in which quantum graphs with singular two-particle interactions are considered. More generally, the configuration space of an N-particle system is given by an N-dimensional cubical network.

To state our main result, let us briefly describe our model; the elaborate constructions will be given in Section 2. Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{V})$ be the 1-particle quantum graph with vertex set $\mathcal{V} = \mathbb{Z}^d$ and edge set $\mathcal{E}$ consisting of all line segments of length 1 between two neighbouring vertices. This graph is naturally embedded in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and we denote by $\Gamma^{(1)} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ the image of the embedding. Define $\Gamma^{(N)} := \Gamma^{(1)} \times \ldots \times \Gamma^{(1)} \subset (\mathbb{R}^d)^N = \mathbb{R}^{Nd}$ and regard $\Gamma^{(N)}$ as a couple $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{S})$, where $\mathcal{K}$ is a collection of N-dimensional unit cubes κ, and $\mathcal{S}$ the collection of the boundaries σ of κ. Each σ is a closed union of $2N$ "open faces" σ^i, i.e. $\sigma = \cup_i \bar{\sigma}^i$. Now fix $q_-, q_+ \in \mathbb{R}$, $q_- < q_+$, let μ be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$ with support $[q_-, q_+]$, and consider the probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ given by $\Omega := [q_-, q_+]^{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\mathbb{P} := \otimes_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \mu$, and the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} := \oplus_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} L^2\big([0,1]^N\big)$. Then given $\omega = (\omega_e) \in \Omega$, $H^{(N)}(\omega)$ is the unique self adjoint operator on $\mathcal{H}$ corresponding to the form

$$\mathfrak{h}^\omega[f,g] = \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} [\langle \nabla f_\kappa, \nabla g_\kappa \rangle + \langle V_\kappa^\omega f_\kappa, g_\kappa \rangle],$$

$$D(\mathfrak{h}^\omega) = \left\{ f = (f_\kappa) \in \bigoplus_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} W^{1,2}\big((0,1)^N\big) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{c} f \text{ is continuous on each } \sigma^i, \\ \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} \|f_\kappa\|^2_{W^{1,2}} < \infty \end{array} \right\}.$$

Here $V_\kappa^\omega := U + W_\kappa^\omega$, where U is a non-random interaction potential. We assume U is non-negative, bounded, and have finite range (see the precise conditions in Section 2). If $\kappa \equiv (e_1, \ldots, e_N)$, then $W_\kappa^\omega := \omega_{e_1} + \ldots + \omega_{e_N}$ is an N-particle random potential. By continuity on σ^i, we mean that if σ^i is a common face to κ_1 and κ_2, then $f_{\kappa_1}|_{\sigma^i} = f_{\kappa_2}|_{\sigma^i}$ in the trace sense.

Given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}$ put $\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{x}) := \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{Nd} : |\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}| < 1\}$, where $|\mathbf{z}| := \|\mathbf{z}\|_\infty$ is the sup norm and $\chi_{\mathbf{x}} := \chi_{\Gamma^{(N)} \cap \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{x})}$. We say that $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ *decays exponentially with mass* $m > 0$ if

$$\limsup_{|\mathbf{x}| \to \infty} \frac{\log \|\chi_{\mathbf{x}} \psi\|}{|\mathbf{x}|} \leq -m.$$

We may now state our main results. In both theorems we assume μ is Hölder continuous.

Theorem 1.1. *There exists* $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(d,N) > 0$ *and* $m > 0$ *such that for a.e.* ω *the spectrum of* $H^{(N)}(\omega)$ *in* $I = [Nq_-, Nq_- + \varepsilon_0]$ *is pure point and the eigenfunctions corresponding to eigenvalues in* I *decay exponentially with mass* m.

Theorem 1.2. *There exists* $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(d,N) > 0$ *such that for* $I = [Nq_-, Nq_- + \varepsilon_0]$, *we have for any bounded* $K \subset \Gamma^{(N)}$ *and all* $s > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big\{ \sup_{\|f\| \leq 1} \|X^{s/2} f(H^{(N)}(\omega)) E_\omega(I) \chi_K\|_2^2 \Big\} < \infty,$$

where $(X\psi)(\boldsymbol{x}) := |\boldsymbol{x}|\psi(\boldsymbol{x})$ *for* $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$, E_ω *is the spectral projection of* $H^{(N)}(\omega)$ *and the supremum is taken over bounded Borel functions,* $\|f\| := \|f\|_\infty$.

As we will show that the lower part of $\sigma(H^{(N)}(\omega))$ contains $[Nq_-, Nq_+]$ almost surely, our results simply state that $H^{(N)}$ exhibits exponential and strong HS-dynamical localization of any order near its spectral edge. We shall prove it using the multi-particle multiscale analysis initially developped by Chulaevsky and Suhov in [9], and then adapted to the continuum by A. Boutet de Monvel *et al.* in [6]. The now traditional single-particle multiscale analysis was introduced much earlier by Fröhlich and Spencer in [14].

Let us note that for $N = 1$ our theorems improve the main result of [12], first by removing the technical assumption ($\exists \tau > \frac{d}{2} : \mu([q_-, q_- + h]) \leq h^\tau$ for small h), next by establishing strong dynamical localization in the HS norm. We are able to remove the assumption on μ by proving Lifshitz-type asymptotics for this model in Section 7, which to the best of our knowledge, were not proven in earlier papers.

2. Multi-particle Quantum Graphs

2.1. **1-Graphs.** Our building block will be the 1-particle quantum graph $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{V})$ considered in [12], which is given by the vertex set $\mathcal{V} = \mathbb{Z}^d$ and edge set $\mathcal{E}$ consisting of all line segments of length 1 between two neighbouring vertices. This graph is naturally embedded in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and we denote by $\Gamma^{(1)} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ the image of the embedding. Each edge e is oriented in the sense of increasing coordinate in $\mathbb{R}^d$, with initial and terminal vertices ιe and τe respectively.

Each edge e is identified with $[0,1]$ via a map φ_e which sends ιe and τe to 0 and 1 respectively. Functions f on $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{V})$ are then identified with (f_e) where $f_e := f \circ \varphi_e^{-1} : [0,1] \to \mathbb{C}$ and we define $f'(x) := f_e'(x)$ in the interior of e.

Since any $A \subset \Gamma^{(1)}$ takes the form $A = \bigcup A_{e_j}$ for some disjoint $A_{e_j} \subset e_j$, a natural measure on $\Gamma^{(1)}$ is given by $m^{(1)}(A) := \sum |A_{e_j}|$, where $|\cdot|$ is the Lebesgue measure on $[0,1]$. $L^2(\Gamma^{(1)}, dm^{(1)})$ can then be identified with $\oplus_{e\in\mathcal{E}} L^2[0,1]$.

The model is finally introduced as follows: fix $q_-, q_+ \in \mathbb{R}$, $q_- < q_+$ and let μ be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$ with support $[q_-, q_+]$. Consider the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} := \oplus_{e\in\mathcal{E}} L^2[0,1]$ and the probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$, where $\Omega := [q_-, q_+]^{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\mathbb{P} = \otimes_{e\in\mathcal{E}} \mu$. Then for $\omega \in \Omega$, the Schrödinger operator is defined via the form

$$\mathfrak{h}^\omega[f,g] = \sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}} [\langle f_e', g_e' \rangle + \langle \omega_e f_e, g_e \rangle], \qquad D(\mathfrak{h}^\omega) = W^{1,2}(\Gamma^{(1)}),$$

where

$$W^{1,2}(\Gamma^{(1)}) := \left\{ f \in \bigoplus_{e\in\mathcal{E}} W^{1,2}(0,1) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{c} f \text{ is continuous at each } v \in \mathcal{V}, \\ \sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}} \|f_e\|^2_{W^{1,2}} < \infty \end{array} \right\}.$$

This form corresponds to the self-adjoint operator $H^{(1)}(\omega) : (f_e) \mapsto (-f_e'' + \omega_e f_e)$ with Kirchhoff boundary conditions (i.e. f is continuous at v and $\sum\limits_{e:\iota e = v} f_e'(0) - \sum\limits_{e:\tau e = v} f_e'(1) = 0$ for each v). It is easily shown that $H^{(1)}$ is ergodic w.r.t. lattice translations, which implies the existence of an almost sure spectrum Σ. It is shown in [12] that $\Sigma = [q_-, +\infty)$ and that localization holds near the lower edge of Σ.

2.2. **n-Graphs.** Let us now consider n-particle systems. Formally, quantum mechanics tells us that the Hilbert space corresponding to n distinguishable particles, each living in $\Gamma^{(1)}$, is the tensor product $L^2(\Gamma^{(1)}, dm^{(1)}) \otimes \ldots \otimes L^2(\Gamma^{(1)}, dm^{(1)})$. Taking $\Gamma^{(n)} := \Gamma^{(1)} \times \ldots \times \Gamma^{(1)}$ and $m := m^{(1)} \otimes \ldots \otimes m^{(1)}$, this space may be identified with $L^2(\Gamma^{(n)}, dm)$. This is in accordance with the intuitive reason we gave in Section 1 why we have to consider the cartesian product $\Gamma^{(n)}$ for such systems.

By identifying the n-tuple of edges $(e_1, \dots, e_n)$ with the cube given by their product, we may regard $\Gamma^{(n)}$ as a couple $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{S})$, where $\mathcal{K}$ is a collection of n-dimensional cubes κ and $\mathcal{S}$ is the collection of the boundaries σ of κ.

For $d = 1$, $\Gamma^{(2)}$ covers all $\mathbb{R}^2$, and consists of all unit squares cornered in the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^2$. For $d = 2$, let x, y, z, t be the coordinate axes of $\mathbb{R}^4$. Then $\Gamma^{(2)}$ lives in the planes xz, xt, yz and yt, and all their lattice translates, and consists of unit squares cornered in $\mathbb{Z}^4$. Squares in the planes xy and zt (and their lattice translates) are not allowed. More generally, $\Gamma^{(2)}$ lives in the lattice translates of d^2 planes in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and each affine plane is an infinite collection of κ.

For $n = 3$, the only case that can be visualized is that of $d = 1$, in which case $\Gamma^{(3)}$ is simply the set of all cubes of unit volume cornered in the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^3$. Once $d > 1$, we no longer take all cubes lying in $\mathbb{R}^{nd}$: $\Gamma^{(n)}$ consists of a collection of affine n-dimensional planes, and each affine plane is an infinite collection of κ.

Each point $\mathbf{x} \in \kappa$ takes the form $\mathbf{x} = (m_1 + x^1 h_{j_1}, \dots, m_n + x^n h_{j_n})$, where $m_j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $(h_j)_{j=1}^d$ is the natural basis of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and $x^i \in [0,1]$. Each κ may thus be identified with $[0,1]^n$ via a map φ_κ that sends such point to $(x^1, \dots, x^n)$. Functions f on $\Gamma^{(n)}$ are then identified with (f_κ) where $f_\kappa := f \circ \varphi_\kappa^{-1} : [0,1]^n \to \mathbb{C}$ and we put $\nabla f := \nabla f_\kappa$ in the interior of κ. This also identifies $L^2(\Gamma^{(n)}, dm)$ with $\oplus_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} L^2([0,1]^n)$; the condition $\|f\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma^{(n)})} < \infty$ then becomes $\sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} \|f_\kappa\|^2_{L^2[0,1]^n} < \infty$.

Each σ is the closed union of $2n$ "open faces" σ^i of dimension $n-1$ which may be identified with $(0,1)^{n-1}$.

Whenever we write $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma^{(n)}$, we mean that $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is regarded as an element in $\mathbb{R}^{nd}$, with $x_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$. If we need to consider elements in the cubes $[0,1]^n$, i.e. after identification, we shall denote them by $(x^1, \dots, x^n)$, with $x^i \in [0,1]$.

We denote $\Gamma := \Gamma^{(n)}$ when there is no confusion. Given $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ and a partition $\{1, \dots, n\} = \mathcal{J} \cup \mathcal{J}^c$, we put $x_{\mathcal{J}} := (x_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$, $x_{\mathcal{J}^c} := (x_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}^c}$ and define

$$\operatorname{dist}(x_{\mathcal{J}}, x_{\mathcal{J}^c}) := \min\{|x_i - x_j| : i \in \mathcal{J}, j \in \mathcal{J}^c\},$$

where $|\cdot|$ is the sup norm. We may now introduce our model. Fix $q_-, q_+ \in \mathbb{R}$, $q_- < q_+$, and let μ be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$ with support $[q_-, q_+]$. Take as probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$, where $\Omega := [q_-, q_+]^{\mathcal{E}(\Gamma^{(1)})}$ and $\mathbb{P} := \otimes_{e \in \mathcal{E}(\Gamma^{(1)})} \mu$, and as Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} := \oplus_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} L^2[0,1]^n$. Then $H^{(n)}(\omega)$ is the operator associated with the form

$$\mathfrak{h}^\omega[f, g] = \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} [\langle \nabla f_\kappa, \nabla g_\kappa \rangle + \langle V_\kappa^\omega f_\kappa, g_\kappa \rangle], \qquad D(\mathfrak{h}^\omega) = W^{1,2}(\Gamma),$$

where

$$W^{1,2}(\Gamma) := \left\{ f \in \bigoplus_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} W^{1,2}((0,1)^n) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{c} f \text{ is continuous on each } \sigma^i, \\ \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} \|f_\kappa\|^2_{W^{1,2}} < \infty \end{array} \right\}.$$

By continuity on σ^i we mean that whenever σ^i is a common face to κ_1 and κ_2, then $f_{\kappa_1}|_{\sigma^i} = f_{\kappa_2}|_{\sigma^i}$ in the trace sense. The potential is given by $V_\kappa^\omega := U + W_\kappa^\omega$, where $W_\kappa^\omega := \omega_{e_1} + \ldots + \omega_{e_n}$ for $\kappa \equiv (e_1, \ldots e_n)$ is an n-particle random potential. U is a non-random interaction potential with the following properties:

(1) U is a sum of k-body interaction potentials:

$$U(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{1 \le i_1 < \ldots < i_k \le n} U^{(k)}(x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}).$$

(2) U is bounded and non-negative: there exists $u_0 > 0$ such that

$$0 \le U(\mathbf{x}) \le u_0.$$

(3) U has finite range: there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that

$$\operatorname{dist}(x_{\mathcal{J}}, x_{\mathcal{J}^c}) \ge r_0 \implies U(\mathbf{x}) = U(x_{\mathcal{J}}) + U(x_{\mathcal{J}^c})$$

for any partition $\{1, \ldots, n\} = \mathcal{J} \cup \mathcal{J}^c$.

(4) There is no one-particle potential:

$$U(x) = 0 \qquad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Note that by (4), the sum in (1) actually starts from $k = 2$. Furthermore, $U \equiv 0$ for $n = 1$. For $n = 2$, U reduces to one function verifying for $(x_1, x_2) \in \Gamma^{(2)} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$

$$0 \le U(x_1, x_2) \le u_0 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_1 - x_2| \ge r_0 \implies U(x_1, x_2) = 0.$$

We may assume $r_0 \in \mathbb{N}$; if this is not the case, we just consider $[r_0] + 1$.

Theorem 2.1. *Given $\omega \in \Omega$, $\mathfrak{h}^\omega$ is closed and densely defined. The unique self-adjoint operator $H^{(n)}(\omega)$ associated with $\mathfrak{h}^\omega$ is given by*

$$H^{(n)}(\omega)(f_\kappa) = (-\Delta f_\kappa + V_\kappa^\omega f_\kappa), \qquad \text{for } (f_\kappa) \in D(H^{(n)}(\omega))$$

Proof. See the Appendix (Section 12). □

We will not need $H^{(n)}(\omega)$ to be ergodic, but we shall prove in Theorem 3.3 that the lower part of $\sigma(H^{(n)}(\omega))$ is deterministic.

We did not provide the explicit domain in the previous theorem as it is not needed in the sequel. It is a subtle question to know exactly how regular the functions $(f_\kappa) \in D(H^{(n)})$ are; in particular, it is a priori not clear if the normal derivatives of f_κ even have a trace on σ^i. For $n = 1$, it is easy to see that if $(f_e) \in D(H^{(1)})$, then $f_e \in W^{2,2}(0, 1)$ for each e. This gives a meaning in particular to the Kirchhoff conditions mentioned above. Once $n \ge 2$ however, corner singularities appear which, in general, destroy the optimal regularity of the f_κ, see e.g. [17]. While it is known that for a single cube κ with Dirichlet or Neumann conditions we have $f_\kappa \in W^{2,2}((0, 1)^n)$ (see [17, Section 3.2]), this result is not clear in our context where we study a collection of cubes with transmission conditions. See [30, Section 2.3.2] for some results in this direction when $n = 2$ and the preprint [5] for some boundary conditions ensuring regularity also when $n = 2$. For general n-dimensional polyhedral interface problems, we record the result of [3].

3. Finite-Volume Operators and Cubes Geometry

3.1. **Finite Volumes.** Throughout the paper we use the sup norm in $\mathbb{R}^{nd}$:

$$|x| := \|x\|_\infty, \qquad |\mathbf{x}| := \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$. A 1-cube of center $u \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is the set

$$\Lambda_L^{(1)}(u) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x - u| < L\}, \qquad |\Lambda_L^{(1)}(u)| = (2L)^d.$$

For $1 \leq n \leq N$, an n-cube of center $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \ldots, u_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$ is the set

$$\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) = \Lambda_L^{(1)}(u_1) \times \ldots \times \Lambda_L^{(1)}(u_n) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd} : |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u}| < L\}.$$

Note that our cubes are always open with center in $\mathbb{Z}^{nd}$, and we will also suppose that $L \in \mathbb{N}$ to guarantee that the closure of $\Gamma^{(n)} \cap \Lambda_L^{(n)}$ is a subgraph of $\Gamma^{(n)}$. Abusing notation, this closure will also be denoted by $\Gamma^{(n)} \cap \Lambda_L^{(n)}$. For 1-graphs, taking the closure simply means that we add the vertices lying on $\partial\Lambda_L^{(1)}$ that belong to inner edges, so that $\Gamma^{(1)} \cap \Lambda_L^{(1)}$ is a finite compact graph. This should not be confused with the subgraph $\Gamma^{(1)} \cap \bar{\Lambda}_L^{(1)}$ which is much larger.

Lemma 3.1. *The following estimates hold:*

$$\#\{\mathcal{E}(\Gamma^{(1)} \cap \Lambda_L^{(1)})\} = d(2L)(2L-1)^{d-1} \leq d \cdot |\Lambda_L^{(1)}|, \tag{NB.1}$$

$$\#\{\mathcal{K}(\Gamma^{(n)} \cap \Lambda_L^{(n)})\} = d^n(2L)^n(2L-1)^{nd-n} \leq d^n \cdot |\Lambda_L^{(n)}|. \tag{NB.n}$$

Proof. See the Appendix (Section 12). □

We now define the *discrete cubes*

$$B_L(u) = \Lambda_L^{(1)}(u) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d, \qquad \mathbf{B}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) = \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$$

and the *cells*

$$C(u) = \Lambda_1^{(1)}(u) \subset \mathbb{R}^d, \qquad \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{u}) = \Lambda_1^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \subset \mathbb{R}^{nd}.$$

A finite union of cells will be called a *cellular set*. For $L \geq 7$, we define the *outer layers*

$$\Lambda_L^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathbf{u}) = \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \setminus \Lambda_{L-6}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}), \qquad \mathbf{B}_L^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathbf{u}) = \Lambda_L^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathbf{u}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{nd}.$$

The following elementary lemma will be useful in the multi-scale induction:

Lemma 3.2. *Given m cubes $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u}_{(j)})$, there exists $\tilde{m}$ disjoint cubes $\Lambda_{l_j}^{(n)}$ such that*

1) $l_j = n_j(L+7)$ *for some* $n_j \in \mathbb{N}$.
2) $\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} l_j = m(L+7)$.
3) $\bigcup_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \Lambda_{l_j-7}^{(n)} \supseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u}_{(j)})$.

Proof. See the Appendix (Section 12). □

3.2. **Operators on cubes.** We now define the restriction of $H^{(n)}$ to a cube $\Lambda^{(n)}$ with Neumann boundary conditions to be the operator $H_\Lambda^{(n)}$ associated with the form

$$\mathfrak{h}_\Lambda^\omega[f,g] = \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\Gamma\cap\Lambda)} \left[\langle \nabla f_\kappa, \nabla g_\kappa\rangle + \langle V_\kappa^\omega f_\kappa, g_\kappa\rangle\right], \qquad D(\mathfrak{h}_\Lambda^\omega) = W^{1,2}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda^{(n)}).$$

Similarly, the Neumann Laplacian $-\Delta_\Lambda^N$ is the operator associated with

$$\mathfrak{h}_\Lambda[f,g] = \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\Gamma\cap\Lambda)} \langle \nabla f_\kappa, \nabla g_\kappa\rangle, \qquad D(\mathfrak{h}_\Lambda) = W^{1,2}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda^{(n)}).$$

It will occasionally be useful to study the Neumann-decoupled operator $-\Delta_\Lambda^{N,\mathrm{dec}}$, which is defined via the form

$$\mathfrak{h}_\Lambda^{\mathrm{dec}}[f,g] = \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\Gamma\cap\Lambda)} \langle \nabla f_\kappa, \nabla g_\kappa\rangle, \qquad D(\mathfrak{h}_\Lambda^{\mathrm{dec}}) = \bigoplus_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\Gamma\cap\Lambda)} W^{1,2}((0,1)^n).$$

Since $D(\mathfrak{h}_\Lambda^{\mathrm{dec}}) \supset D(\mathfrak{h}_\Lambda)$, we have $-\Delta_\Lambda^N \geq -\Delta_\Lambda^{N,\,\mathrm{dec}}$. We may now describe the spectra of $H^{(n)}$ and $H_\Lambda^{(n)}$:

Theorem 3.3. *There exists* $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Omega$ *with* $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_0) = 1$ *such that for all* $\omega \in \Omega_0$:

$$[nq_-, nq_+] \subset \sigma(H^{(n)}(\omega)) \subseteq [nq_-, +\infty).$$

In particular, $\inf \sigma(H^{(n)}(\omega)) = nq_-$ *almost surely.*

Proof. See the Appendix (Section 12). □

Lemma 3.4. $H_\Lambda^{(n)}$ *has a compact resolvent. Its discrete set of eigenvalues denoted by* $E_j(H_\Lambda^{(n)})$ *counting multiplicity verify the following Weyl law:*

$$\text{(WEYL.}n\text{)} \qquad \forall S \in \mathbb{R}\ \exists C = C(n,d,S-nq_-):\ j > C|\Lambda^{(n)}| \implies E_j(H_\Lambda^{(n)}) > S.$$

If $q_- \geq 0$, *we may choose* C *independent of* q_-, *and if* S *is large,* $C \approx \frac{d^n(S-nq_-)^{n/2}}{(4\pi)^{n/2}\Gamma(n/2)}$.

Proof. See the Appendix (Section 12). □

In the rest of this article, for a bounded volume $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ we put

$$\chi_\Omega := \chi_{\Gamma\cap\Omega}, \qquad \chi_{\mathbf{x}} := \chi_{\Gamma\cap\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{x})}.$$

We finally introduce the resolvents: for $z \notin \sigma(H_\Lambda^{(1)})$, $E \notin \sigma(H_\Lambda^{(n)})$,

$$G_{\Lambda^{(1)}}(z) := (H_\Lambda^{(1)} - z)^{-1}, \qquad G_{\Lambda^{(n)}}(E) := (H_\Lambda^{(n)} - E)^{-1}$$

and for $i, j \in \Lambda^{(1)} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \Lambda^{(n)} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$ the *resolvent operator kernels*

$$G_{\Lambda^{(1)}}(i,j;z) := \chi_i G_{\Lambda^{(1)}}(z)\chi_j, \qquad G_{\Lambda^{(n)}}(\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j};E) := \chi_{\mathbf{i}} G_{\Lambda^{(n)}}(E)\chi_{\mathbf{j}}.$$

3.3. **Geometry of cubes.** Given $n \geq 2$, a cube $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is said to be *decomposable* if there exists a partition $\{1,\dots,n\} = \mathcal{J} \cup \mathcal{J}^c$ with

$$\operatorname{dist}(u_{\mathcal{J}}, u_{\mathcal{J}^c}) \geq 2L + r_0.$$

In this case any $\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ verifies $\operatorname{dist}(x_{\mathcal{J}}, x_{\mathcal{J}^c}) > r_0$, so $U(\mathbf{x}) = U(x_{\mathcal{J}}) + U(x_{\mathcal{J}^c})$. Denoting by $n' = \#\mathcal{J}$, $n'' = n - n'$, we thus have $H_{\Lambda_L(\mathbf{u})}^{(n)} = H_{\Lambda_L(u_{\mathcal{J}})}^{(n')} + H_{\Lambda_L(u_{\mathcal{J}^c})}^{(n'')}$. Using the identification $L^2(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})) \equiv L^2(\Gamma^{(n')} \cap \Lambda_L^{(n')}(u_{\mathcal{J}})) \otimes L^2(\Gamma^{(n'')} \cap \Lambda_L^{(n'')}(u_{\mathcal{J}^c}))$, it follows from [35, Theorem VIII.33] that the normalized eigenfunctions of $H_{\Lambda_L(\mathbf{u})}^{(n)}$ take the form $\Psi_{a,b}(\mathbf{x}) = \varphi_a(x_{\mathcal{J}}) \otimes \psi_b(x_{\mathcal{J}^c})$ with corresponding eigenvalues $E_{a,b} = \lambda_a + \mu_b$, where φ_a and ψ_b are the normalized eigenfunctions of $H_{\Lambda_L(u_{\mathcal{J}})}^{(n')}$ and $H_{\Lambda_L(u_{\mathcal{J}^c})}^{(n'')}$, with eigenvalues λ_a and μ_b respectively. Now given an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors $\{\Psi_k\}$ of $H_\Lambda^{(n)}$ and a Borel function $\eta : \sigma(H_\Lambda^{(n)}) \to \mathbb{C}$, we have by the functional calculus

$$\eta(H_\Lambda^{(n)}) = \sum_k \eta(E_k) P_k,$$

where $P_k g := \langle g, \Psi_k \rangle \Psi_k$ for $g \in L^2(\Gamma \cap \Lambda^{(n)})$. Thus if $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is decomposable, we have $P_{a,b} = P_a \otimes P_b$ and we get the representation

$$\eta(H_{\Lambda_L(\mathbf{u})}^{(n)}) = \sum_a P_a \otimes \Big(\sum_b \eta(E_{a,b}) P_b \Big). \tag{3-1}$$

It will be convenient to know which cubes are decomposable according to their distance from the diagonal

$$\mathbb{D} := \{\mathbf{x} = (x, \dots, x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{nd}.$$

We say that $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is *partially interactive* (PI) if $\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbb{D}) \geq (n-1)(2L + r_0)$, and *fully interactive* (FI) otherwise. For the link with decomposability, we need the following notion.

Given $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$ and $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{J} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, we say that $\mathcal{P} = \{y_j : j \in \mathcal{J}\}$ is *R-connected* if $\mathcal{Z} = \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \Lambda_R^{(1)}(y_j) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is connected. In this case, if $\#\mathcal{J} \geq 2$, each y_j is at a distance $< 2R$ from its neighbour and at a distance $< 4R$ from the next one and so on. Hence

$$\forall i, j \in \mathcal{J} : |y_i - y_j| < (\#\mathcal{J} - 1)(2R) \leq 2(n-1)R.$$

Lemma 3.5. *A partially interactive cube is decomposable.*

Proof. See the Appendix (Section 12). □

For $j = 1, \dots, n$, we define projections of n-cubes on the $\mathbb{R}^d$ space by

$$\Pi_j \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) = \Lambda_L^{(1)}(u_j), \qquad \Pi \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} \Lambda_L^{(1)}(u_j).$$

For $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{J} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, we put

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{J}} \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) = \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \Pi_j \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) = \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \Lambda_L^{(1)}(u_j).$$

Then $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is said to be $\mathcal{J}$-separable from $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})$ if

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{J}} \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \cap \left(\Pi_{\mathcal{J}^c} \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \cup \Pi \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})\right) = \emptyset.$$

$\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ and $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})$ are said to be *separable* if there exists $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{J} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is $\mathcal{J}$-separable from $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})$ or $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})$ is $\mathcal{J}$-separable from $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$. They are said to be *completely separated* if $\mathcal{J} = \{1, \dots, n\}$, i.e. if $\Pi \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \cap \Pi \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) = \emptyset$. Finally, they are said to be *distant* if they are separable and if $|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}| \geq r_{n,L}$, where

$$r_{n,L} := 4(n-1)(2L + r_0) + 2L.$$

Let us give some criteria for separability. Given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$, put

$$k_{\mathbf{x}} := \#\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}.$$

Then each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$ gives rise to $k_{\mathbf{x}}^n$ related points denoted by $\mathbf{x}^{(j)} = (x_1^{(j)}, \dots, x_n^{(j)})$, with $x_k^{(j)} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ for all k. For example, for $d = 1$, the point $(1, 5) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ gives rise to $(1, 1), (1, 5), (5, 1)$ and $(5, 5)$. Taking

$$K(n) := n^n,$$

we have $k_{\mathbf{x}}^n \leq K(n)$ and the following lemmas hold.

Lemma 3.6. *Given $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$ and $L \in \mathbb{N}$,*

1) *If $\boldsymbol{y} \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{K(n)} \Lambda_{2nL}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(j)})$, then $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{y})$ and $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ are separable.*
2) *If $\boldsymbol{y} \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{K(n)} \Lambda_{r_{n,L}}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(j)})$, then $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{y})$ and $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ are distant.*
3) *If $\boldsymbol{y} \notin \Lambda_{r_{n,L}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{0})$, then $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{y})$ and $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{0})$ are distant.*
4) *If $\boldsymbol{y} \notin \Lambda_{2r_{n,L}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{0})$, then $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{y})$ is distant from any $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ verifying $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Lambda_{r_{n,L}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{0})$.*

Proof. See the Appendix (Section 12). ☐

Lemma 3.7. *If $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u})$ and $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{v})$ are two FI cubes with $|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v}| \geq r_{n,L}$, then they are completely separated. In particular, distant FI cubes are completely separated.*

Proof. See the Appendix (Section 12). ☐

3.4. **MSA strategy.** We summarize here the multiscale analysis strategy which we follow to prove localization. Let us start with 1-particle systems:

1. Establish with a good probability that there exists $L_0 > 0$ and an interval I in which at least 1 of any 2 disjoint cubes $\Lambda_{L_0}(u), \Lambda_{L_0}(v)$ is "good", in the sense that for $E \in I$, we have $\|G_{\Lambda_{L_0}}(i,j;E)\| \leq e^{-mL_0}$ for some $m > 0$ and all i, j far apart. This is the content of the initial length scale estimate (ILS).
2. Find a sequence of length scales $L_k \nearrow^{\infty}$ for which a similar decay property holds, with an increasingly good probability (typically $1 - L_k^{-2p}$ for some $p > 0$). This is done by induction on k and is the heart of multiscale analysis.
3. Use this sequence to show that the generalized eigenfunctions of $H^{(1)}$ corresponding to generalized eigenvalues in I exhibit an exponential decay.
4. Deduce exponential localization by proving that generalized eigenfunctions of $H^{(1)}$ exist spectrally almost everywhere.
5. Establish dynamical localization.

For step 1, one shows that if a cube Λ is "bad", then $\operatorname{dist}(\sigma(H_\Lambda^{(1)}), \inf \sigma(H^{(1)}))$ must be very small. This is done ad absurdum using a *Combes-Thomas estimate.* Then one proves this distance cannot be too small using *Lifshitz tails* (one can also prove step 1 without Lifshitz tails in some cases). For step 2, one first relates $G_{\Lambda'}(x,y;E)$ to $G_\Lambda(z,y;E)$ for $\Lambda' \supset \Lambda$ to deduce the decay of $G_{\Lambda_{L_k}}(x,y;E)$ from the decay of $G_{\Lambda_{L_{k-1}}}(z,y;E)$. This is done using the *Geometric resolvent inequality.* However, in this inequality the decay term from $G_{\Lambda_{L_{k-1}}}(z,y;E)$ gets multiplied by $\|G_{\Lambda_{L_k}}(x,w;E)\|$. So to make sure the product remains very small, it is necessary to show that $\|G_{\Lambda_{L_k}}(x,w;E)\|$ is not too big. This is done using *Wegner estimates.* The remaining steps are detailed later.

The main difficulty in the adaptation of the previous scheme to study multi-particle systems lies in the fact that Hamiltonians restricted to disjoint cubes are no longer independent. One may try to overcome this difficulty by applying the above scheme to completely separated cubes only, since in this case the corresponding Hamiltonians are independent. Unfortunately this cannot work; the problem is that roughly speaking there are not enough completely separated cubes to make the multiscale analysis work. This is why one is forced to work with an intermediate class between the disjoint cubes and the completely separated ones, namely the separable cubes. As Hamiltonians restricted to such cubes are still not independent, a new strategy must be conceived specially in the induction step.

4. Combes-Thomas estimate

Here we prove a Combes-Thomas estimate below the spectral edge using a semigroup approach as in [13], where the authors make use of the explicit form of the heat kernel. Since such precise information is a priori not available in our case, we shall instead prove that our operator satisfies a Davies-Gaffney estimate (see Lemma 4.2). This also has the advantage of simplifying the estimates a little bit.

Let us start with a technical lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\Lambda^{(n)}$ be an open cube or $\Lambda^{(n)} = \mathbb{R}^{nd}$. If $u \in W^{1,2}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda^{(n)})$ and φ is uniformly Lipschitz continuous on $\Gamma \cap \Lambda^{(n)}$, then $\varphi u \in W^{1,2}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda^{(n)})$ and $\nabla(\varphi u) = u\nabla\varphi + \varphi\nabla u$.*

Proof. By [37, Proposition 4.1.27], we have $\varphi_\kappa u_\kappa \in W^{1,2}((0,1)^n)$ and $\nabla(\varphi_\kappa u_\kappa) = u_\kappa \nabla\varphi_\kappa + \varphi_\kappa \nabla u_\kappa$ for all κ. It thus remains to show that φu is continuous on σ^i. By the density of $C^\infty([0,1]^n)$ in $W^{1,2}((0,1)^n)$ (see [26, Section 1.1.6]) and the continuity of the trace operator $\gamma : W^{1,2}((0,1)^n) \to L^2((0,1)^{n-1})$, we may assume all $u_\kappa \in C([0,1]^n)$. Since φ is Lipshitz continuous, it follows that $\varphi_\kappa u_\kappa \in C([0,1]^n)$, so that $\gamma(\varphi_\kappa u_\kappa)$ is just the restriction of $\varphi_\kappa u_\kappa$ to $\partial\kappa$. Thus, if σ^i is a common face to κ_1 and κ_2 we get for $x \in \sigma^i$:

$$\gamma(\varphi_{\kappa_1} u_{\kappa_1})(x) = \varphi_{\kappa_1}(x) u_{\kappa_1}(x) = \varphi_{\kappa_2}(x) u_{\kappa_2}(x) = \gamma(\varphi_{\kappa_2} u_{\kappa_2})(x)$$

since u is continuous on σ^i. Hence φu is continuous on σ^i. □

In the following $\operatorname{dist}(\cdot,\cdot)$ refers to the distance induced by the sup norm of $\mathbb{R}^{nd}$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\Lambda^{(n)}$ be an open cube or $\Lambda^{(n)} = \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ and $A_1, A_2 \subset \Lambda^{(n)}$ be cellular sets such that* $\operatorname{dist}(A_1, A_2) := \delta \geq 1$. *Let $v_\omega := \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{x \in \Lambda^{(n)}} V^\omega(x)$ and $f_j \in L^2(\Gamma \cap \Lambda^{(n)})$ be supported in $\Gamma \cap A_j$. Then*

$$\forall t > 0 : |\langle e^{-tH_\Lambda^{(n)}(\omega)} f_1, f_2 \rangle| \leq e^{-tv_\omega} e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{4t}} \|f_1\| \|f_2\|.$$

Proof. Fix $\Lambda^{(n)}$, put $H := H_\Lambda^{(n)}(\omega) - v_\omega$ and for $\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda^{(n)}$, let $\tilde{w}(\mathbf{x}) := \operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}, A_1)$. Then $|\tilde{w}(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{w}(\mathbf{y})| \leq |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|$, hence $\|\nabla\tilde{w}\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $e^{\tilde{w}(\mathbf{x})}$ is uniformly Lipschitz continuous in $\Lambda^{(n)}$. Let w be the restriction of $\tilde{w}$ to Γ. Then by Lemma 4.1, $\varphi u := (e^{w(\cdot)} u_\kappa) \in D(\mathfrak{h})$ whenever $u \in D(\mathfrak{h})$. Now given $f \in D(H)$, $t > 0$ and $\mathbf{x} \in M := \Gamma \cap \Lambda^{(n)}$, put $f_t(\mathbf{x}) = e^{-tH} f(\mathbf{x})$ and note that $f_t \in D(H)$. Fix $\beta > 0$ and as in [10, Theorem 3.3] consider

$$E(t) = \int_M |f_t(\mathbf{x})|^2 e^{\beta w(\mathbf{x})} dm(\mathbf{x}) = \langle f_t, f_t e^{\beta w} \rangle_{L^2(M)}.$$

Then

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t, f_t e^{\beta w} \rangle = -2 \operatorname{Re} \langle H f_t, f_t e^{\beta w} \rangle = -2 \operatorname{Re} \mathfrak{h}[f_t, f_t e^{\beta w}].$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{E'(t)}{2} &= -\operatorname{Re}\big(\langle \nabla f_t, \nabla(f_t e^{\beta w}) \rangle + \langle (V^\omega - v_\omega) f_t, f_t e^{\beta w} \rangle\big) \\ &\leq -\operatorname{Re}\big(\langle \nabla f_t, (\nabla f_t) e^{\beta w} \rangle + \langle \nabla f_t, f_t \beta (\nabla w) e^{\beta w} \rangle\big) \\ &\leq \int_M \big(-|\nabla f_t|^2 + \beta |\nabla f_t| |\nabla w| |f_t|\big) e^{\beta w} dm \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \int_M \beta^2 |\nabla w|^2 |f_t|^2 e^{\beta w} dm \leq \frac{\beta^2 E(t)}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

since $(a - \frac{b}{2})^2 \geq 0$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence $E(t) \leq e^{\beta^2 t/2} E(0)$. Moreover,

$$\int_{A_2} |f_t|^2 e^{\beta w} dm \geq e^{\beta\delta} \int_{A_2} |f_t|^2 dm,$$

hence if $\operatorname{supp} f \subset A_1$, noting that $w = 0$ on A_1 we get

$$\int_{A_2} |f_t|^2 dm \leq e^{-\beta\delta} E(t) \leq \exp\big(\frac{\beta^2 t}{2} - \beta\delta\big) E(0) = \exp\big(\frac{\beta^2 t}{2} - \beta\delta\big) \int_{A_1} |f|^2 dm.$$

Choose $\beta = \delta/t$. Then given $g \in L^2(M, dm)$ supported in A_2 we finally obtain

$$|\langle e^{-tH} f, g\rangle|^2 \leq \int_{A_2} |e^{-tH} f|^2 dm \cdot \|g\|^2 \leq e^{-\delta^2/2t} \|f\|^2 \|g\|^2.$$

The assertion follows by noting that H is densely defined and that

$$e^{-tH} = \exp(-t(H_\Lambda^{(n)}(\omega) - v_\omega)) = e^{tv_\omega} e^{-tH_\Lambda^{(n)}(\omega)}. \qquad \square$$

Theorem 4.3 (Combes-Thomas estimate)**.** *Let* $\Lambda^{(n)}$ *be an open cube or* $\Lambda^{(n)} = \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ *and* $A, B \subset \Lambda^{(n)}$ *be cellular sets such that* $\operatorname{dist}(A, B) := \delta \geq 1$*. Then for* $E < v_\omega := \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{x \in \Lambda^{(n)}} V_\omega(x)$ *and* $\eta := v_\omega - E$ *we have*

$$\|\chi_A (H_\Lambda^{(n)}(\omega) - E)^{-1} \chi_B\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \Big(\frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{\eta^{3/4}} + \frac{3}{8\sqrt{\delta}\eta^{5/4}} \Big) e^{-\delta\sqrt{\eta}}.$$

Proof. Put $H = H_\Lambda^{(n)}(\omega)$. Given $f, g \in L^2(\Gamma \cap \Lambda^{(n)})$ with $\|f\| = \|g\| = 1$ we have

$$|\langle \chi_A e^{-tH} \chi_B f, g\rangle| = |\langle e^{-tH} \chi_B f, \chi_A g\rangle| \leq e^{-tv_\omega} e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{4t}} \|\chi_B f\| \|\chi_A g\| \leq e^{-tv_\omega} e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{4t}}$$

by Lemma 4.2. Thus

$$\|\chi_A e^{-tH} \chi_B\| \leq e^{-tv_\omega} e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{4t}}.$$

Now for $E < v_\omega$ we have $(H - E)^{-1} = \int_0^\infty e^{tE} e^{-tH} dt$. Hence

$$\|\chi_A (H - E)^{-1} \chi_B\| \leq \int_0^\infty e^{-t\eta} e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{4t}} dt = \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\eta}} K_1(\delta\sqrt{\eta})$$

where K_1 is the modified Bessel function of second kind and we used [16, Formula 3.324] to evaluate the integral. Now by [1, Formula 9.7.2] and the remark after it we have

$$K_1(z) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2z}} e^{-z} (1 + \frac{3}{8z})$$

for real $z > 0$, which proves the assertion. $\square$

5. Geometric Resolvent Inequalities

In this section we prove the geometric resolvent inequalities mentioned in Subsection 3.4. For a cellular set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ and $1 \leq k \leq \infty$, we put

$$\tilde{C}_c^k(\Gamma \cap \Omega) := \{f|_\Gamma : f \in C_c^k(\Omega)\}, \qquad W_0^{1,2}(\Gamma \cap \Omega) := \{f \in W^{1,2}(\Gamma \cap \Omega) : f|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}$$

where $f|_{\partial\Omega}$ is understood in the trace sense. We start with a lemma which is obvious in the continuum.

Lemma 5.1. *Let* $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ *be an open cube. Then for all* $h \in (W_0^{1,2}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda))^n$ *and* $w \in W^{1,2}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda)$ *:*

$$\langle \nabla \cdot h, w\rangle = -\langle h, \nabla w\rangle.$$

Proof. Let $h = ((h_\kappa^{(1)}), \ldots, (h_\kappa^{(n)}))$ and $w = (w_\kappa)$. Using the notation $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \equiv \partial_i$, we have by Green's formula (see e.g. [17, Theorem 1.5.3.1]) for any $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda)$ with $\sigma = \partial\kappa$:

$$\langle \partial_i h_\kappa^{(i)}, w_\kappa\rangle = -\langle h_\kappa^{(i)}, \partial_i w_\kappa\rangle + \int_\sigma h_\kappa^{(i)} \bar{w}_\kappa \nu^{(i)} d\sigma, \tag{5-1}$$

where the values of $h_\kappa^{(i)} \bar{w}_\kappa$ on σ are understood in the trace sense and $\nu := (\nu^{(1)}, \ldots, \nu^{(n)})$ is the outward unit vector normal to σ, well defined on each σ^j. Denote points in κ by

$(x^1, \dots, x^n)$, with $x^i \in [0,1]$. If σ^j is the face with points $(x^1, \dots, x^{j-1}, 0, x^{j+1}, \dots, x^n) := \hat{x}_0^j$ and if $\sigma^{o(j)}$ is the face opposite to it with points $(x^1, \dots, x^{j-1}, 1, x^{j+1}, \dots, x^n) := \hat{x}_1^j$, then $\nu|_{\sigma^j} = (0, \dots, 0, -1, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $\nu|_{\sigma^{o(j)}} = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Hence

$$\int_{\sigma} h_{\kappa}^{(i)} \bar{w}_{\kappa} \nu^{(i)} d\sigma = \int_{\sigma^{o(i)}} h_{\kappa}^{(i)}(\hat{x}_1^i) \bar{w}_{\kappa}(\hat{x}_1^i) d\hat{x}^i - \int_{\sigma^i} h_{\kappa}^{(i)}(\hat{x}_0^i) \bar{w}_{\kappa}(\hat{x}_0^i) d\hat{x}^i,$$

where $d\hat{x}^i := dx^1 \dots dx^{i-1} dx^{i+1} \dots dx^n$. Now consider

$$\sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda)} \Big(\int_{\sigma^{o(i)}(\kappa)} h_{\kappa}^{(i)}(\hat{x}_1^i) \bar{w}_{\kappa}(\hat{x}_1^i) d\hat{x}^i - \int_{\sigma^i(\kappa)} h_{\kappa}^{(i)}(\hat{x}_0^i) \bar{w}_{\kappa}(\hat{x}_0^i) d\hat{x}^i \Big).$$

Since $h|_{\partial\Lambda} = 0$, this sum may be re-arranged as

$$\sum_{\text{inner } \sigma^i} \sum_{j=1}^{d} \int_{\sigma^i} \Big\{ h^{(i)}_{\kappa_j^-(\sigma^i)}(\hat{x}_1^i) \bar{w}_{\kappa_j^-(\sigma^i)}(\hat{x}_1^i) - h^{(i)}_{\kappa_j^+(\sigma^i)}(\hat{x}_0^i) \bar{w}_{\kappa_j^+(\sigma^i)}(\hat{x}_0^i) \Big\} d\hat{x}^i,$$

where κ_j^- and κ_j^+, $j = 1, \dots, d$ are the $2d$ cubes containing σ^i as a common face. But by hypothesis $h^{(i)}\bar{w}$ are continuous on σ^i, i.e. $h^{(i)}_{\kappa_j^-}(\hat{x}_1^i) \bar{w}_{\kappa_j^-}(\hat{x}_1^i) = h^{(i)}_{\kappa_j^+}(\hat{x}_0^i) \bar{w}_{\kappa_j^+}(\hat{x}_0^i)$. Hence the sum vanishes and $\sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda)} \int_{\sigma(\kappa)} h_{\kappa}^{(i)} \bar{w}_{\kappa} \nu^{(i)} d\sigma = 0$. The assertion thus follows by summing in (5-1) over $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda)$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$. $\square$

Theorem 5.2 (Geometric Resolvent Equation)**.** *Let* $\Lambda_1^{(n)} \subseteq \Lambda_2^{(n)} \subset \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ *be open cubes,* $\psi \in \tilde{C}_c^{\infty}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_1^{(n)})$ *real-valued, and* $E \in \rho(H_{\Lambda_1}^{(n)}) \cap \rho(H_{\Lambda_2}^{(n)})$. *Then*

$$G_{\Lambda_1^{(n)}}(E)\psi = \psi G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}}(E) + G_{\Lambda_1^{(n)}}(E)\left((\nabla\psi) \cdot \nabla + \nabla \cdot (\nabla\psi)\right) G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}}(E) \tag{GRE}$$

as operators on $L^2(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_2^{(n)})$.

Proof. Let $g \in L^2(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_2^{(n)})$, $u := (\psi G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} + G_{\Lambda_1^{(n)}}\left((\nabla\psi) \cdot \nabla + \nabla \cdot (\nabla\psi)\right) G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}})g$, where $G_{\Lambda} := G_{\Lambda}(E)$. It suffices to show that $u \in D(\mathfrak{h}_{\Lambda_1^{(n)}})$ and

$$(\mathfrak{h}_{\Lambda_1^{(n)}} - E)[u, w] = \langle \psi g, w \rangle \qquad \text{for all } w \in D(\mathfrak{h}_{\Lambda_1^{(n)}}).$$

Since $\psi \in \tilde{C}_c^{\infty}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_1^{(n)})$ and $G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g \in W^{1,2}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_2^{(n)})$, we have $\psi G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g \in D(\mathfrak{h}_{\Lambda_1^{(n)}})$ by Lemma 4.1. Similarly $(\nabla\psi) G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g \in (W^{1,2}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_1^{(n)}))^n$, so $\nabla \cdot (\nabla\psi) G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g \in L^2(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_1^{(n)})$ and $G_{\Lambda_1^{(n)}} \nabla \cdot (\nabla\psi) G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g \in D(H_{\Lambda_1}^{(n)})$. Finally $(\nabla\psi) \cdot \nabla G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g \in L^2(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_1^{(n)})$, hence $G_{\Lambda_1^{(n)}}(\nabla\psi) \cdot \nabla G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g \in D(H_{\Lambda_1}^{(n)})$. Thus, $u \in D(\mathfrak{h}_{\Lambda_1^{(n)}})$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathfrak{h}_{\Lambda_1^{(n)}} - E)[u, w] &= (\mathfrak{h}_{\Lambda_1^{(n)}} - E)[\psi G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g, w] + \langle ((\nabla\psi) \cdot \nabla + \nabla \cdot (\nabla\psi)) G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g, w \rangle \\
&= (\mathfrak{h}_{\Lambda_1^{(n)}} - E)[\psi G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g, w] + \langle (\nabla\psi) \cdot \nabla(G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g), w \rangle - \langle (\nabla\psi) G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g, \nabla w \rangle \\
&= \langle \psi \nabla(G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g), \nabla w \rangle + \langle (V^{\omega} - E)\psi G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g, w \rangle + \langle \nabla(G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g), (\nabla\psi) w \rangle \\
&= (\mathfrak{h}_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} - E)[G_{\Lambda_2^{(n)}} g, \psi w] = \langle g, \psi w \rangle = \langle \psi g, w \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 5.1 in the second equality. $\square$

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\Lambda^{(n)}$ be an open cube or $\Lambda^{(n)} = \mathbb{R}^{nd}$, let $\tilde{\Omega} \subset \Omega \subset \Lambda^{(n)}$ be cellular sets with* $\operatorname{dist}(\partial\Omega, \partial\tilde{\Omega}) \geq 1$ *and $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded interval. Then there exists $C = C(I, n, d, q_-) > 0$ such that given $E \in I$, every $f \in D(H_\Lambda^{(n)})$ satisfies*

$$\|\chi_{\tilde{\Omega}} \nabla f\| \leq C \cdot (\|\chi_\Omega (H_\Lambda^{(n)} - E) f\| + \|\chi_\Omega f\|). \tag{SOL}$$

Proof. Since $\operatorname{dist}(\partial\Omega, \partial\tilde{\Omega}) \geq 1$, we may choose $\psi \in \tilde{C}_c^\infty(\Gamma \cap \Omega)$, $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$ with $\psi \equiv 1$ on $\Gamma \cap \tilde{\Omega}$ and $\|\nabla\psi\|_\infty \leq C_1(nd)$. Let $w := f\psi^2$, then $w \in D(\mathfrak{h}_\Lambda)$ by Lemma 4.1 and

$$\langle \nabla f, \nabla w \rangle = \langle \psi \nabla f, \psi \nabla f \rangle + 2\langle \psi \nabla f, f \nabla \psi \rangle.$$

Denoting $g := (H_\Lambda^{(n)} - E) f$ we thus get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi \nabla f\|^2 &= \langle \nabla f, \nabla w \rangle - 2\langle \psi \nabla f, f \nabla \psi \rangle \\ &= \langle g, w \rangle - \langle (V^\omega - E) f, w \rangle - 2\langle \psi \nabla f, f \nabla \psi \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\langle (V^\omega - E) f, w \rangle = \int_{\Gamma \cap \Lambda^{(n)}} (V^\omega - E) |f|^2 \psi^2 dm \geq (nq_- - E) \|f\psi\|^2,$$

then taking $C_2 := |nq_- - E|$ we get by the choice of ψ

$$\|\psi \nabla f\|^2 \leq \|g\|_\Omega \|f\|_\Omega + C_2 \|f\|_\Omega^2 + 2C_1 \|\psi \nabla f\| \|f\|_\Omega$$

where $\|\phi\|_\Omega := \|\chi_\Omega \phi\|$. Hence

$$\big(\|\psi \nabla f\| - C_1 \|f\|_\Omega\big)^2 \leq \|g\|_\Omega \|f\|_\Omega + (C_1^2 + C_2) \|f\|_\Omega^2 \leq \Big(C_3 \|f\|_\Omega + \frac{1}{2C_3} \|g\|_\Omega\Big)^2,$$

where $C_3 := \sqrt{C_1^2 + C_2}$. Hence

$$\|\psi \nabla f\| \leq C_3 \|f\|_\Omega + \frac{1}{2C_3} \|g\|_\Omega + C_1 \|f\|_\Omega. \qquad \square$$

Theorem 5.4. *Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded interval, $\Lambda_l^{(n)} \subset \Lambda_L^{(n)}$ be open cubes with $l \geq 7$, and $A \subseteq \Lambda_{l-6}^{(n)}$, $B \subseteq \Lambda_L^{(n)} \setminus \Lambda_l^{(n)}$ be cellular sets. Then there exists $C = C(I, n, d, q_-) > 0$ such that for all $E \in \rho(H_{\Lambda_L}^{(2)}) \cap \rho(H_{\Lambda_l}^{(2)}) \cap I$:*

$$\|\chi_A G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}}(E) \chi_B\| \leq C \cdot \|\chi_A G_{\Lambda_l^{(n)}}(E) \chi_{\Lambda_l^{\mathrm{out}}}\| \cdot \|\chi_{\Lambda_l^{\mathrm{out}}} G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}}(E) \chi_B\| \tag{GRI.1}$$

In particular, if $\mathbf{u} \in \Lambda_{l-7}^{(n)}$ and $\Lambda_l^{(n)} \subset \Lambda_{L-7}^{(n)}$, then given $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{B}_L^{\mathrm{out}}$, we have

$$\|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}; E)\| \leq C \cdot |\mathbf{B}_l^{\mathrm{out}}|^2 \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{B}_l^{\mathrm{out}}} \|G_{\Lambda_l^{(n)}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}; E)\| \max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{B}_l^{\mathrm{out}}} \|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}; E)\| \tag{GRI.2}$$

Proof. Let $G_\Lambda := G_\Lambda(E)$, $\Omega = \operatorname{int} \Lambda_l^{\mathrm{out}}$ and choose a real valued $\psi \in \tilde{C}_c^\infty(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_l^{(n)})$ such that $\psi = 1$ on $\Lambda_{l-4}^{(n)}$, $\operatorname{supp} \psi \subset \Lambda_{l-2}^{(n)}$ and $\|\nabla\psi\|_\infty$ is bounded independently of $\Lambda_l^{(n)}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_A G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}} \chi_B\| &= \|\chi_A (\psi G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}} - G_{\Lambda_l^{(n)}} \psi) \chi_B\| \qquad (\psi|_A = 1, \psi|_B = 0) \\ &= \|\chi_A (G_{\Lambda_l^{(n)}} ((\nabla\psi) \cdot \nabla + \nabla \cdot (\nabla\psi)) G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}}) \chi_B\| \qquad \text{(GRE)} \\ &\leq \|\chi_A G_{\Lambda_l^{(n)}} (\nabla\psi) \cdot \nabla G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}} \chi_B\| + \|\chi_A G_{\Lambda_l^{(n)}} \nabla \cdot (\nabla\psi) G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}} \chi_B\|. \end{aligned}$$

Now let $\tilde\Omega = \operatorname{int}(\Lambda^{(n)}_{l-1} \setminus \Lambda^{(n)}_{l-5})$, so $\operatorname{supp} \nabla\psi \subset \tilde\Omega$ and $\operatorname{dist}(\partial\Omega, \partial\tilde\Omega) = 1$. Hence given $f_1, f_2 \in L^2(\Gamma \cap \Lambda^{(n)}_L)$, $\|f_1\| = \|f_2\| = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \chi_A G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_l} (\nabla\psi) \cdot \nabla G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} \chi_B f_1, f_2\rangle| &= |\langle \nabla G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} \chi_B f_1, (\nabla\psi) G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_l} \chi_A f_2\rangle| \\ &\le \|\nabla\psi\|_\infty \|\chi_{\tilde\Omega} \nabla G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} \chi_B\| \|\chi_{\tilde\Omega} G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_l} \chi_A\|. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, using Lemma 5.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \chi_A G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_l} \nabla \cdot (\nabla\psi) G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} \chi_B f_1, f_2\rangle| &= |\langle f_1, \chi_B G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} (\nabla\psi) \nabla G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_l} \chi_A f_2\rangle| \\ &\le \|\nabla\psi\|_\infty \|\chi_B G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} \chi_{\tilde\Omega}\| \|\chi_{\tilde\Omega} \nabla G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_l} \chi_A\|. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that for a bounded operator T we have $\|T\| = \|T^*\|$, we thus get

$$\|\chi_A G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} \chi_B\| \le \|\nabla\psi\|_\infty (\|\chi_A G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_l} \chi_{\tilde\Omega}\| \|\chi_{\tilde\Omega} \nabla G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} \chi_B\| + \|\chi_{\tilde\Omega} \nabla G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_l} \chi_A\| \|\chi_{\tilde\Omega} G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} \chi_B\|)$$

Now by Lemma 5.3, we can find C_1 such that

$$\|\chi_{\tilde\Omega} \nabla G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} \chi_B\| \le C_1 \cdot \|\chi_\Omega G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} \chi_B\|.$$

Indeed, given $u \in L^2(\Gamma \cap \Lambda^{(n)}_L)$, we apply (SOL) to $f = G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} \chi_B u$. Noting that $(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_L} - E) f = \chi_B u = 0$ on Ω we get

$$\|\chi_{\tilde\Omega} \nabla G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} \chi_B u\| \le C_1 \cdot \|\chi_\Omega G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} \chi_B u\|.$$

As u is arbitrary, the assertion follows. In the way we find C_2 such that

$$\|\chi_{\tilde\Omega} \nabla G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_l} \chi_A\| \le C_2 \cdot \|\chi_\Omega G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_l} \chi_A\| = C_2 \cdot \|\chi_A G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_l} \chi_\Omega\|.$$

Noting that $\tilde\Omega \subset \Omega$, we finally get

$$\|\chi_A G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} \chi_B\| \le C \cdot \|\chi_A G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_l} \chi_\Omega\| \cdot \|\chi_\Omega G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L} \chi_B\|$$

for $C = \max(2C_1\|\nabla\psi\|_\infty, 2C_2\|\nabla\psi\|_\infty)$. We thus have (GRI.1).

Finally, note that $\Lambda^{\text{out}}_l \subseteq \bigcup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{B}^{\text{out}}_l} \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{w})$, so (GRI.1) gives us

$$\|\chi_{\mathbf{u}} G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L}(E) \chi_{\mathbf{y}}\| \le C \sum_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{B}^{\text{out}}_l} \|\chi_{\mathbf{u}} G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_l}(E) \chi_{\mathbf{w}}\| \|\chi_{\mathbf{z}} G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L}(E) \chi_{\mathbf{y}}\|. \qquad \square$$

Since $\|T\| = \|T^*\|$ for a bounded operator T, Theorem 5.4 also provides bounds on $\|\chi_B G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L}(E) \chi_A\|$. It also follows that $\|G_\Lambda(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}; E)\| = \|G_\Lambda(\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{i}; E)\|$.

We now compare resolvents of decomposable n-cubes with those of n'-cubes for $n' < n$. Recall that if $\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{u})$ is decomposable, then there exists a partition $\{1, \ldots, n\} = \mathcal{J} \cup \mathcal{J}^c$ such that $H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_L(\mathbf{u})} = H^{(n')}_{\Lambda_L(u_{\mathcal{J}})} + H^{(n'')}_{\Lambda_L(u_{\mathcal{J}^c})}$, where $n' = \#\mathcal{J}$ and $n'' = n - n'$. Let $\Sigma' = \{\lambda_a\}$ and $\Sigma'' = \{\mu_b\}$ be the spectra of $H^{(n')}_{\Lambda_L(u_{\mathcal{J}})}$ and $H^{(n'')}_{\Lambda_L(u_{\mathcal{J}^c})}$ respectively.

Theorem 5.5. *Let $\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\boldsymbol{u})$ be a decomposable cube and $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{B}^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{u})$. Suppose $E \in \rho(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_L(\boldsymbol{u})})$ and $S > 0$ is large enough. Then if $\delta_1 := |x_{\mathcal{J}^c} - y_{\mathcal{J}^c}| > 2$,*

$$\text{(GRI.3)} \quad \|G_{\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{u})}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; E)\| \le M_1 \cdot \max_{a \le M_1} \|G_{\Lambda^{(n'')}_L(u_{\mathcal{J}^c})}(x_{\mathcal{J}^c}, y_{\mathcal{J}^c}; E - \lambda_a)\| + |\Lambda^{(n')}_L| e^{-\delta_1 S}$$

for $M_1 \approx \frac{d^{n'}((4S)^2+E-nq_-)^{n'/2}}{(4\pi)^{n'/2}\Gamma(n'/2)} \cdot |\Lambda_L^{(n')}|$, *and if* $\delta_2 := |x_{\mathcal{J}} - y_{\mathcal{J}}| > 2$,

$$\text{(GRI.3)} \qquad \|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y};E)\| \le M_2 \cdot \max_{b \le M_2} \|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n')}(u_{\mathcal{J}})}(x_{\mathcal{J}}, y_{\mathcal{J}}; E-\mu_b)\| + |\Lambda_L^{(n'')}|e^{-\delta_2 S}$$

for $M_2 \approx \frac{d^{n''}((4S)^2+E-nq_-)^{n''/2}}{(4\pi)^{n''/2}\Gamma(n''/2)} \cdot |\Lambda_L^{(n'')}|$.

Proof. Put $\Lambda^{(n)} := \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$, $\Lambda_1^{(n')} := \Lambda_L^{(n')}(u_{\mathcal{J}})$ and $\Lambda_2^{(n'')} := \Lambda_L^{(n'')}(u_{\mathcal{J}^c})$. Using representation (3-1) with $\eta(t) := (t-E)^{-1}$ we get

$$G_{\Lambda^{(n)}}(E) = \sum_a P_a \otimes \Big(\sum_b \frac{1}{\mu_b - (E-\lambda_a)} P_b\Big) = \sum_a P_a \otimes G_{\Lambda_2^{(n'')}}(E-\lambda_a).$$

Hence noting that $G_{\Lambda^{(n)}}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y};E) := \chi_{\mathbf{x}} G_{\Lambda^{(n)}}(E)\chi_{\mathbf{y}}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|G_{\Lambda^{(n)}}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y};E)\| &\le \sum_a \|\chi_{x_{\mathcal{J}}} P_a \chi_{y_{\mathcal{J}}} \otimes \chi_{x_{\mathcal{J}^c}} G_{\Lambda_2^{(n'')}}(E-\lambda_a)\chi_{y_{\mathcal{J}^c}}\| \\ &\le \sum_a \|\chi_{x_{\mathcal{J}^c}} G_{\Lambda_2^{(n'')}}(E-\lambda_a)\chi_{y_{\mathcal{J}^c}}\|.\end{aligned}$$

Now given $S_j >> 1$, by (WEYL.n') there exists $C_j \approx \frac{d^{n'}(S_j+E-nq_-)^{n'/2}}{(4\pi)^{n'/2}\Gamma(n'/2)}$ such that

$$a > C_j|\Lambda_1^{(n')}| \implies \lambda_a > S_j + E - n''q_- \implies \eta_a > S_j,$$

where $\eta_a := n''q_- - (E-\lambda_a)$. Hence if $\delta_1 > 2$, taking $\delta := \operatorname{dist}(C(x_{\mathcal{J}^c}), C(y_{\mathcal{J}^c})) = \delta_1 - 2$ and $S_j := (4Sj)^2$, we get by Combes-Thomas estimate,

$$\sum_{a=C_j|\Lambda_1^{(n')}|+1}^{C_{j+1}|\Lambda_1^{(n')}|} \|G_{\Lambda_2^{(n'')}}(x_{\mathcal{J}^c}, y_{\mathcal{J}^c}; E-\lambda_a)\| \le (C_{j+1}-C_j)|\Lambda_1^{(n')}|e^{-\delta\sqrt{\frac{S_j}{2}}} \le |\Lambda_1^{(n')}|e^{-\delta\frac{\sqrt{S_j}}{2}}$$

provided S is large enough. Hence

$$\sum_{a>C_1|\Lambda_1^{(n')}|} \|G_{\Lambda_2^{(n'')}}(x_{\mathcal{J}^c}, y_{\mathcal{J}^c}; E-\lambda_a)\| \le |\Lambda_1^{(n')}| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{-\delta\frac{\sqrt{S_j}}{2}}.$$

But

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{-\delta\frac{\sqrt{S_j}}{2}} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{-(2\delta S)j} = \frac{e^{-2\delta S}}{1-e^{-2\delta S}} \le 2e^{-2\delta S} \le e^{-\delta_1 S}.$$

We thus obtain the first bound with $M_1 := C_1|\Lambda_1^{(n')}|$. The second bound is proved in the same way. □

6. Wegner Estimates

We now establish Wegner-type bounds for our model. We first follow the ideas of [8] to prove a single-volume bound (Theorem 6.1) and then deduce the two-volume bound (Theorem 6.3) using measure-theoretic arguments.

For a probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$ we put

$$s(\mu,\varepsilon) := \sup\{\mu[a,b] : b-a \le \varepsilon\}$$

and denote for $J \subset \mathcal{E}(\Gamma^{(1)})$, and $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_J(f(\omega)) := \int_{[q_-,q_+]^J} f(\omega) d\mu^J((\omega_e)_{e\in J})$$

Theorem 6.1. *Given* $E \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\varepsilon > 0$, *there exists* $C = C(n, d, E + \varepsilon - nq_-)$ *such that for any cube* $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u})$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{\operatorname{dist}(\sigma(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_L(\boldsymbol{u})}), E) < \varepsilon\} \le C \cdot |\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u})| \cdot |\Pi_1\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u})| \cdot s(\mu, 2\varepsilon).$$

Proof. Put $\Lambda := \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$. By Lemma 3.4, we may find $C' = C'(n, d, E + \varepsilon - nq_-)$ such that $E_j(\omega) := E_j(H_\Lambda^{(n)}(\omega)) > E + \varepsilon$ if $j > C' \cdot |\Lambda|$. Hence

$$\mathbb{P}\{\operatorname{dist}(\sigma(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_L(\mathbf{u})}), E) < \varepsilon\} \le \sum_{j\le C'|\Lambda|} \mathbb{P}\{\omega : |E_j(\omega) - E| < \varepsilon\}. \tag{6-1}$$

Since $E_j(\omega)$ depends only on $(\omega_e), e \in \Pi := \mathcal{E}(\Gamma^{(1)} \cap \Pi\Lambda)$, taking $J := \mathcal{E}(\Gamma^{(1)} \cap \Pi_1\Lambda)$ we have by definition of $\mathbb{P}$ and the Fubini theorem

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\{\omega : |E_j(\omega) - E| < \varepsilon\} &= \mu^\Pi\{(\omega_e)_{e\in\Pi} : |E_j(\omega) - E| < \varepsilon\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\Pi\setminus J}(\mu^J\{(\omega_e)_{e\in J} : |E_j(\omega) - E| < \varepsilon\}). \qquad (6\text{-}2)\end{aligned}$$

Now given $\kappa \equiv (e_1, \ldots, e_n) \in \mathcal{K}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda)$ we have

$$W_\kappa^\omega = \omega_{e_1} + \ldots + \omega_{e_n} = \sum_{e\in\Pi} c_\kappa(e)\omega_e, \quad \text{where } c_\kappa(e) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e = e_j \text{ for some } j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Hence

$$W_\kappa^\omega = \sum_{e\in J} c_\kappa(e)\omega_e + \sum_{e\in\Pi\setminus J} c_\kappa(e)\omega_e = W_\omega^{(J)}(\kappa) + W_\omega^{(\Pi\setminus J)}(\kappa).$$

Note that $W_\omega^{(\Pi\setminus J)}(\kappa)$ is zero if $e_j = e_1$ for all j. Thus $H_\Lambda^{(n)}(\omega)$ takes the form

$$H_\Lambda^{(n)}(\omega) = -\Delta + U + W_\omega^{(\Pi\setminus J)} + W_\omega^{(J)} = K_\omega^{(\Pi\setminus J)} + W_\omega^{(J)},$$

where the operator $K_\omega^{(\Pi\setminus J)}$ does not depend on $(\omega_e)_{e\in J}$.

For each $v = (v_e)_{e\in J} \in \mathbb{R}^J$, define the operator $B(v)$ on $L^2(\Gamma \cap \Lambda)$ by

$$B(v)(f_\kappa) := \Big(\sum_{e\in J} c_\kappa(e) v_e f_\kappa\Big),$$

i.e. each component f_κ is multiplied by $\sum_{e\in J} c_\kappa(e)v_e$. Using the notation $\omega^J = (\omega_e)_{e\in J}$, we have $\omega^J \in [q_-, q_+]^J \subset \mathbb{R}^J$ and $(\omega^J)_e = \omega_e$. So we get in particular

$$B(\omega^J)(f_\kappa) = \big(W_\omega^{(J)}(\kappa) f_\kappa\big).$$

Now given $t \ge 0$, denoting $\mathbf{1} := (1, \ldots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^J$ we have

$$B(v + t \cdot \mathbf{1})(f_\kappa) = B(v)(f_\kappa) + t(n_\kappa f_\kappa),$$

where $n_\kappa := \sum_{e\in J} c_\kappa(e)$. Since every $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda)$ takes the form $(e_1, \ldots, e_n)$ with $e_1 \in \mathcal{E}(\Gamma \cap \Pi_1\Lambda) = J$, we have $1 \le n_\kappa \le n$. Hence

$$\langle B(v + t \cdot \mathbf{1})(f_\kappa), (f_\kappa)\rangle \ge \langle B(v)(f_\kappa), (f_\kappa)\rangle + t \cdot \langle (f_\kappa), (f_\kappa)\rangle.$$

Taking $\|(f_\kappa)\| = 1$ and $H(v) := B(v) + K$ where K is an operator independent of v, we get

$$\langle H(v + t \cdot \mathbf{1})(f_\kappa), (f_\kappa)\rangle \geq \langle H(v)(f_\kappa), (f_\kappa)\rangle + t.$$

Denoting the eigenvalues of $H(v)$ by $E^{(j)}(v)$, we obtain by the min-max principle

$$E^{(j)}(v + t \cdot \mathbf{1}) \geq E^{(j)}(v) + t.$$

Finally note that if $v^{(1)} \leq v^{(2)}$ (i.e. $v_e^{(1)} \leq v_e^{(2)}$ $\forall e \in J$), then $H(v^{(1)}) \leq H(v^{(2)})$ and $E^{(j)}(v^{(1)}) \leq E^{(j)}(v^{(2)})$. We may thus apply Stollmann's lemma (see [38]) to get

$$\mu^J\{v : |E^{(j)}(v) - E| < \varepsilon\} \leq |J| \cdot s(\mu, 2\varepsilon) \leq d \cdot |\Pi_1\Lambda| \cdot s(\mu, 2\varepsilon)$$

by (NB.1). Now given $\omega \in \Omega$, taking $K := K_\omega^{(\Pi\setminus J)}$ we have $H_\Lambda^{(n)}(\omega) = K_\omega^{(\Pi\setminus J)} + W_\omega^{(J)} = B(\omega^J) + K_\omega^{(\Pi\setminus J)} = H(\omega^J)$. Hence $E_j(\omega) = E^{(j)}(\omega^J)$ and we finally get

$$\mu^J\{\omega^J : |E_j(\omega) - E| < \varepsilon\} \leq d \cdot |\Pi_1\Lambda| \cdot s(\mu, 2\varepsilon),$$

from which the theorem follows by (6-1) and (6-2). □

Remark 6.2. If $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{J} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $\Pi_\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{u}) := \mathcal{E}(\Gamma^{(1)} \cap \Pi_\mathcal{J}\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}))$, then we also have

$$\mu^{\Pi_\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{u})}\{(\omega_e)_{e\in\Pi_\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{u})} : \operatorname{dist}(\sigma(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_L(\mathbf{u})}), E) < \varepsilon\} \leq C \cdot |\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})| \cdot |\Pi_1\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})| \cdot s(\mu, 2\varepsilon)$$

for any $(\omega_e)_{e\in\Pi_{\mathcal{J}^c}(\mathbf{u})}$. To see this, restart the proof of Theorem 6.1 with this LHS, then after reaching inequality (6-1), take instead $J = \mathcal{E}(\Gamma \cap \Pi_j\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}))$ for an arbitrary $j \in \mathcal{J}$. Then

$$\mu^{\Pi_\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{u})}\{(\omega_e)_{e\in\Pi_\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{u})} : |E_j(\omega) - E| < \varepsilon\} = \mathbb{E}_{\Pi_\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{u})\setminus J}(\mu^J\{(\omega_e)_{e\in J} : |E_j(\omega) - E| < \varepsilon\})$$

and estimate the RHS as before. Conclude by noting that $|J| = \#\mathcal{E}(\Gamma \cap \Pi_1\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}))$.

Theorem 6.3. *For any bounded interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $C = C(n, d, q_-, I, \varepsilon)$ such that for any pair of separable cubes $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u})$ and $\Lambda_{L'}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{v})$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\{\operatorname{dist}(\sigma_I(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_L(\boldsymbol{u})}), \sigma_I(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_{L'}(\boldsymbol{v})})) < \varepsilon\} \leq C \cdot |\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u})| \cdot |\Lambda_{L'}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{v})| \cdot |\Pi_1\Lambda| \cdot s(\mu, 2\varepsilon)$$

where $\sigma_I(H_\Lambda^{(n)}) := \sigma(H_\Lambda^{(n)}) \cap I$ and $|\Pi_1\Lambda| := \max\left(|\Pi_1\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u})|, |\Pi_1\Lambda_{L'}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{v})|\right)$.

Proof. Fix $I = [a, b]$ and for $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$, $l = L, L'$, put $\Pi(\mathbf{x}) := \mathcal{E}(\Gamma^{(1)} \cap \Pi\Lambda_l^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}))$ and $\Pi_\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{x}) := \mathcal{E}(\Gamma^{(1)} \cap \Pi_\mathcal{J}\Lambda_l^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}))$. Suppose $\Lambda_{L'}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})$ is $\mathcal{J}$-separable of $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ for some $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{J} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$, i.e. $\Pi_\mathcal{J}\Lambda_{L'}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) \cap \left(\Pi_{\mathcal{J}^c}\Lambda_{L'}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) \cup \Pi\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})\right) = \emptyset$ and put

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= \{\omega : \operatorname{dist}(\sigma_I(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_L(\mathbf{u})}), \sigma_I(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_{L'}(\mathbf{v})})) < \varepsilon\}, \\ B &:= \{(\omega_e)_{e\in\Pi_\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{v})} : \operatorname{dist}(\sigma_I(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_L(\mathbf{u})}), \sigma_I(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_{L'}(\mathbf{v})})) < \varepsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the Hamiltonians in A depend only on $(\omega_e)_{e\in\Pi(\mathbf{u})\cup\Pi(\mathbf{v})}$, we have by definition of $\mathbb{P}$ and the Fubini theorem

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = \mathbb{E}_{\Pi_{\mathcal{J}^c}(\mathbf{v})\cup\Pi(\mathbf{u})}(\mu^{\Pi_\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{v})}(B))$$

Since the eigenvalues $E_1^{(\mathbf{u})} \le E_2^{(\mathbf{u})} \le \dots$ of $H_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})}$ do not depend on the variables $(\omega_e)_{e\in\Pi_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathbf{v})}$, we may use Lemma 3.4 to obtain $C_1 = C_1(n,d,b-nq_-)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^{\Pi_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathbf{v})}(B) &= \mu^{\Pi_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathbf{v})}\Big\{(\omega_e)_{e\in\Pi_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathbf{v})} : \min_{a\le E_k^{(\mathbf{u})}\le b} \operatorname{dist}(E_k^{(\mathbf{u})}, \sigma_I(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_{L'}(\mathbf{v})})) < \varepsilon\Big\}\\ &\le \sum_{k\le C_1|\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})|} \mu^{\Pi_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathbf{v})}\{(\omega_e)_{e\in\Pi_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathbf{v})} : \operatorname{dist}(E_k^{(\mathbf{u})}, \sigma_I(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_{L'}(\mathbf{v})})) < \varepsilon\}\end{aligned}$$

and use Remark 6.2 to bound each term by $C_2 \cdot |\Lambda_{L'}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})| \cdot |\Pi_1\Lambda_{L'}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})| \cdot s(\mu, 2\varepsilon)$ for some $C_2 = C_2(n,d,b+\varepsilon-nq_-)$. Hence we get for $C = C_1 \cdot C_2$

$$\mathbb{P}(A) \le C \cdot |\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})| \cdot |\Lambda_{L'}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})| \cdot |\Pi_1\Lambda_{L'}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})| \cdot s(\mu, 2\varepsilon)$$

as asserted. If however $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ was $\mathcal{J}$-separable of $\Lambda_{L'}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})$, we would get

$$\mathbb{P}(A) \le C \cdot |\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})| \cdot |\Lambda_{L'}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})| \cdot |\Pi_1\Lambda_{L}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})| \cdot s(\mu, 2\varepsilon). \qquad \square$$

7. INITIAL LENGTH SCALE ESTIMATE

In this section we follow the ideas of [37] and use a Cheeger inequality from [34] to prove Lifshitz-type asymptotics for 1-particle systems. We then deduce the Initial Length Scale estimate (ILS) for our model. We speak of Lifshitz-type asymptotics because our result is not formulated in terms of the integrated density of states $N(E)$, as it is not needed in this paper. Theorem 7.1 easily implies bounds of the form $N(E) \le e^{-\gamma'(E-q_-)^{-1/2}}$ for E close enough to q_- if one knows that $N(E) \le \frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\mathbb{E}\left\{\operatorname{tr}[\chi_{(-\infty,E)}(H_\Lambda^{(1)})]\right\}$; see [37, Theorem 2.1.4]. The existence of $N(E)$ was established in [20], see also [18].

In the following for $l \in \mathbb{N}$ we put

$$n_l := \#\mathcal{E}(\Gamma^{(1)} \cap \Lambda_l^{(1)}) = d(2l)(2l-1)^{d-1}.$$

Theorem 7.1. *There exists $b > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\{E_1(H_{\Lambda_l}^{(1)}) \le q_- + bn_l^{-2}\} \le e^{-\gamma n_l}.$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{H}_{\Lambda_l}^{(1)} = H_{\Lambda_l}^{(1)} - q_-$, then $E_1(\tilde{H}_{\Lambda_L}^{(1)}) = E_1(H_{\Lambda_L}^{(1)}) - q_-$, and

$$\mathbb{P}\{E_1(H_{\Lambda_l}^{(1)}) \le q_- + bn_l^{-2}\} = \mathbb{P}\{E_1(\tilde{H}_{\Lambda_l}^{(1)}) \le bn_l^{-2}\}.$$

Now write $\tilde{H}_{\Lambda_l}^{(1)} = (-\Delta + \tilde{W}^\omega)^N_{\Lambda_l^{(1)}}$. We may assume $\tilde{W}^\omega \le 1$ for all ω, since if $\tilde{W}^\omega$ is larger, $E_1(\tilde{H}_{\Lambda_l}^{(1)})$ becomes larger and the probability becomes smaller. Furthermore, if

$$H(\omega,t) = (-\Delta + t\cdot\tilde{W}^\omega)^N_{\Lambda_l^{(1)}} \quad \text{for } t \in [-1,1],$$

then $H(\omega,0) = -\Delta^N_{\Lambda_l^{(1)}}$ and $H(\omega,1) = \tilde{H}_{\Lambda_l}^{(1)}(\omega)$. Since the normalized ground state ϕ_0 of $-\Delta^N_{\Lambda_l^{(1)}}$ is the constant function $(n_l^{-1/2})$, we have by the Feynman–Hellmann theorem

$$E_1(\omega,0)' = \langle \tilde{W}^\omega\phi_0, \phi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{n_l}\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}(\Gamma^{(1)}\cap\Lambda_l^{(1)})} q_e(\omega) := f_l(\omega), \tag{7-1}$$

where $q_e(\omega) = \omega_e - q_- \geq 0$. By [37, Lemma 2.1.1] we can find $s_0, \gamma > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\{f_l(\omega) \leq s_0\} \leq e^{-\gamma n_l}.$$

We now need a Cheeger inequality to estimate the distance of $0 = E_1(\omega, 0)$ to the rest of the spectrum of $H(0) = -\Delta^N_{\Lambda_l^{(1)}}$. Put $X := \Gamma^{(1)} \cap \Lambda_l^{(1)}$ and let $\mathcal{O} = \{Y \subset X : Y \text{ open}, Y \neq X, Y \neq \emptyset\}$. For $Y \in \mathcal{O}$, let $|\partial Y|$ be the number of points on the boundary of Y, $\operatorname{vol}_1 Y$ be the total length of Y and put $Y^c := X \setminus Y$. Then any $Y \in \mathcal{O}$ satisfes $\min(\operatorname{vol}_1 Y, \operatorname{vol}_1 Y^c) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\operatorname{vol}_1 \Gamma^{(1)} \cap \Lambda_l^{(1)}) = \frac{n_l}{2}$, hence the *Cheeger constant* of X verifies

$$h(X) := \inf_{Y \in \mathcal{O}} \frac{|\partial Y|}{\min(\operatorname{vol}_1 Y, \operatorname{vol}_1 Y^c)} \geq \frac{2}{n_l}.$$

By [34, Theorem 6.1], it follows that $E_2(\omega, 0) \geq \frac{1}{4} h(X)^2 \geq n_l^{-2}$. A similar estimate can also be obtained using the Faber-Krahn inequality; see [29].

We may now apply [37, Theorem 4.1.31], to find $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that

$$|E_1(\omega, t) - t \cdot E_1(\omega, 0)'| \leq c_2 n_l^2 t^2 \qquad \forall\, 0 \leq t \leq c_1 n_l^{-2}.$$

Since $E_1(\omega, t)$ is increasing in t, this gives by (7-1)

$$f_l(\omega) = E_1(\omega, 0)' \leq c_2 n_l^2 t + E_1(\tilde{H}^{(1)}_{\Lambda_l}) t^{-1} \qquad \forall\, 0 \leq t \leq c_1 n_l^{-2}.$$

Choose $0 < c_3 \leq c_1$ so small that $c_2 c_3 \leq \frac{1}{2} s_0$. Then for $t = c_3 n_l^{-2}$ we get

$$f_l(\omega) \leq (s_0/2) + E_1(\tilde{H}^{(1)}_{\Lambda_l}) c_3^{-1} n_l^2.$$

Hence, choosing $b > 0$ so small that $b c_3^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{2} s_0$ we finally obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\{E_1(\tilde{H}^{(1)}_{\Lambda_l}) \leq b n_l^{-2}\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{f_l(\omega) \leq s_0\} \leq e^{-\gamma n_l}. \qquad \square$$

Theorem 7.2. *There exists $b > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ such that for all $1 \leq n \leq N$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\{E_1(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_l}) \leq n q_- + n b n_l^{-2}\} \leq e^{-\gamma n_l}.$$

Consequently, for all $\xi > 0$ and $\beta \in (0,1)$, there exists $L_0 = L_0(N, d, \beta, \xi)$ as large as needed such that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\operatorname{dist}(\sigma(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_{L_0}}), n q_-) \leq L_0^{\beta - 1}\} \leq L_0^{-\xi}.$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{H}^{(n)}_{\Lambda_l} = (-\Delta + W^\omega)^N_{\Lambda_l^{(n)}}$. As $U \geq 0$, $H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_l} \geq \tilde{H}^{(n)}_{\Lambda_l}$, hence $E_1(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_l}) \geq E_1(\tilde{H}^{(n)}_{\Lambda_l})$ and

$$\mathbb{P}\{E_1(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_l}) \leq n q_- + n b n_l^{-2}\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{E_1(\tilde{H}^{(n)}_{\Lambda_l}) \leq n q_- + n b n_l^{-2}\}$$

But $\tilde{H}^{(n)}_{\Lambda_l} = H^{(1)}_{\Lambda_l} \otimes I^{n-1} + I \otimes H^{(1)}_{\Lambda_l} \otimes I^{n-2} + \ldots + I^{n-1} \otimes H^{(1)}_{\Lambda_l}$, where $H^{(1)}_{\Lambda_l}$ is the 1-particle Hamiltonian $H^{(1)}_{\Lambda_l} : (f_e) \mapsto (-f_e'' + \omega_e f_e)$. Thus $E_1(\tilde{H}^{(n)}_{\Lambda_l}) = n E_1(H^{(1)}_{\Lambda_l})$ and

$$\mathbb{P}\{E_1(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_l}) \leq n q_- + n b n_l^{-2}\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{E_1(H^{(1)}_{\Lambda_l}) \leq q_- + b n_l^{-2}\}.$$

The existence of b, γ verifying the first estimate now follows from Theorem 7.1. So take these b, γ, and given $\xi > 0$, $\beta \in (0,1)$, choose L^* such that for $L \geq L^*$, we have

$$2^{2nd} b^{-n/2} L^{nd + \frac{n(\beta - 1)}{2}} e^{-\gamma (b L^{1-\beta})^{1/2}} \leq (2L)^{-\xi}. \tag{7-2}$$

where the dependence on n is killed by taking the largest $L^*(n, d, \beta, \xi)$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$. Now given $L \geq L^*$, choose $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $b n_l^{-2} \approx L^{\beta - 1}$, i.e. $l \approx \frac{(b L^{1-\beta})^{1/2d}}{2}$. Next choose $L \le L_0 \le 2L$ such that $L_0 = rl$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$, so that $\Lambda_{L_0}^{(n)}$ may be divided into $N = L_0^{nd} l^{-nd}$ disjoint cubes Λ_l^j. Since $H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_{L_0}} \ge \oplus_k H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_l^k}$, we get $E_1(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_{L_0}}) \ge \min_k E_1(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_l^k})$. Hence using (7-2),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\{\operatorname{dist}(\sigma(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_{L_0}}), nq_-) \le L_0^{\beta-1}\} &\le \mathbb{P}\{E_1(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_{L_0}}) - nq_- \le L^{\beta-1}\} \\ &\le \mathbb{P}\{E_1(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_l^k}) - nq_- \le bn_l^{-2} \text{ for some } k\} \\ &\le \mathbb{P}\{E_1(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_l^k}) - nq_- \le nbn_l^{-2} \text{ for some } k\} \\ &\le Ne^{-\gamma n_l} \le (2L)^{-\xi} \le L_0^{-\xi}. \qquad \square\end{aligned}$$

We finally apply Theorem 7.2 to obtain the (ILS): let $E \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m > 0$. A cube $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is said to be (E, m)-Non Singular ((E, m)-NS) if $E \in \rho(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_L}(\mathbf{u}))$ and

$$\max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{B}_L^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{u})} \|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}; E)\| \le e^{-mL},$$

otherwise it is said to be (E, m)-Singular ((E, m)-S).

Corollary 7.3 (ILS estimate)**.** *For all $p > 0$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$, there exists $L_0 = L_0(N, d, p, \beta)$ as large as needed and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for $I_n = [nq_- - \frac{1}{2}, nq_- + \varepsilon_0]$, $m_0 = \frac{L_0^{(\beta-1)/2}}{3}$ and any cube $\Lambda_{L_0}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u})$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda_{L_0}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u}) \text{ is } (E, m_0)\text{-}S\} \le L_0^{-2p}.$$

Proof. Given $2p \equiv \xi > 0$, $\beta \in (0, 1)$, we find $L \equiv L_0$ as large as needed satisfying Theorem 7.2. Now let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{B}_L^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{u})$, so $L - 8 \le \operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{y})) \le L$. Choose $\varepsilon_0 = \frac{L^{\beta-1}}{2}$ and suppose $\operatorname{dist}(\sigma(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_L(\mathbf{u})}), nq_-) > L^{\beta-1}$. Then taking $v_\omega := \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\mathbf{z} \in \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})} V^\omega(\mathbf{z})$, it follows that $v_\omega - nq_- > L^{\beta-1}$. Hence every $E \in I_n$ verifies $E < v_\omega$ and $\eta := v_\omega - E \ge \frac{L^{\beta-1}}{2}$. So by the Combes-Thomas estimate,

$$\begin{aligned}\|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}; E)\| &\le \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \Big(\frac{L^{1/2}}{(L^{\beta-1}/2)^{3/4}} + \frac{3}{8(L-8)^{1/2}(L^{\beta-1}/2)^{5/4}} \Big) e^{-(L-8)\sqrt{\frac{L^{\beta-1}}{2}}} \\ &\le e^{-m_0 L}\end{aligned}$$

for L large enough. Hence $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is (E, m_0)-NS. So using Theorem 7.2,

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ is } (E, m_0)\text{-S}\} \le \mathbb{P}\{\operatorname{dist}(\sigma(H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_L(\mathbf{u})}), nq_-) \le L^{\beta-1}\} \le L^{-\xi}. \qquad \square$$

8. Multi-Particle Multiscale Analysis

Throughout this section we fix

$$\alpha = 3/2, \qquad \beta = 1/2, \qquad K(n) = n^n$$

and put for $n \ge 2$,

$$p_n := \frac{p_{n-1}}{\alpha^2(1+\theta)} - \frac{(2n-1)d}{2\alpha} - nd - 1,$$

where $\theta := \frac{1}{2p_1}$. We then choose p_1 sufficiently large to make sure that

$$p_N \ge 3Nd + 1.$$

In particular, $0 < \theta < 1$. Taking $p = p_1$, we may find $L_0 = L_0(d, N)$ as large as needed and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that Corollary 7.3 is satisfied for all $1 \leq n \leq N$. We then define the scale of lengths

$$L_{k+1} = [L_k^\alpha] + 1.$$

We now want to construct a sequence of "masses" (m_{L_k}) verifying $m_{L_0} > \frac{48nK(n)}{L_0^{1-\beta}}$ and

$$m_{L_{k+1}} \geq m_{L_k} - \left(\frac{96nK(n)}{L_k^{\alpha-1}} m_{L_k} + \frac{3}{L_k^{\alpha(1-\beta)}}\right) > \frac{48nK(n)}{L_{k+1}^{1-\beta}},$$

such that for the interval $I_n = [nq_- - \frac{1}{2}, nq_- + \varepsilon_0]$, the following property holds:

$$(\mathsf{DS}\colon n, k, m_{L_k}, I_n) \quad \begin{cases} \text{For all pairs of distant cubes } \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ and } \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) : \\ \mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ and } \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) \text{ are } (E, m_{L_k})\text{-S}\} \leq L_k^{-2p_n(1+\theta)^k}. \end{cases}$$

The term $(1+\theta)^k$ in the exponent was introduced in [4] and is new in comparison with the usual multiscale analysis. While it makes a few estimates a bit more complicated, it has a powerful advantage, namely it allows to prove dynamical localization of any order s in I_N, with ε_0 independent of s. This result was previously obtained for single-particle systems in the continuum using the bootstrap multiscale analysis of [15].

For $k = 0$, this property holds for all $1 \leq n \leq N$ by the choice of L_0 (since $p_1 \geq p_n$). To construct the sequence (m_{L_k}), we adapt [11, Lemma 4.2] to graph multi-particle systems in Lemma 8.2 and take $J = 6$. Such m_{L_k} will be decreasing but with a nonzero limit.

We say that a cube $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is *E-Non Resonant* (E-NR) if

$$\operatorname{dist}(\sigma(H_{\Lambda_L(\mathbf{u})}^{(n)}), E) \geq e^{-L^\beta}.$$

We say it is *E-Completely Non-Resonant (E-CNR)* if any $\Lambda_\ell^{(n)} \subseteq \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ with $L^{1/\alpha} \leq \ell \leq L$ is E-NR. The cube is thus E-NR in particular.

To prove $(\mathsf{DS}\colon N, k, m_{L_k}, I_N)$ for all $k \geq 0$, we shall need the following Wegner bound:

$$(\mathsf{W2}\colon n, k, I_n) \quad \begin{cases} \text{For all pairs of distant cubes } \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ and } \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) : \\ \mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ and } \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) \text{ are not } E\text{-CNR}\} \leq \frac{1}{4} L_k^{-2p_1(1+\theta)^k} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 8.1. *If μ is Hölder continuous, then* $(\mathsf{W2}\colon n, k, I_n)$ *holds for all $k \geq 0$ and $1 \leq n \leq N$.*

Proof. Let A be the event in $(\mathsf{W2}\colon n, k, I_n)$. Bounding the number of cubes in $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}$ by $|\mathbf{B}_{L_k}^{(n)}| \leq (2L_k)^{nd}$, it easily follows from Theorem 6.3 that

$$\mathbb{P}(A) \leq C(2L_k)^{4nd+d} s(\mu, 4e^{-L_k^{\beta/\alpha}})$$

for some $C = C(n, d, q_-)$. Since μ is Hölder continuous, there exist c_μ and $b > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(A) \leq Cc_\mu(2L_k)^{4nd+d}(4e^{-L_k^{\beta/\alpha}})^b \leq e^{-L_k^\zeta}$$

for some $\zeta > 0$, since L_0 is large. Now for any $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} -\log(1/4) + 2p_1(1+\theta)^k \log L_k &\leq \log(4) + 2p_1 2^k \log L_k \\ &\leq C_{N,d} 2^k \alpha^k \log L_0 \leq L_0^{\alpha^k \zeta} \end{aligned}$$

since $\alpha^k \geq \frac{\log C}{\zeta \log L_0} + k\frac{\log 2\alpha}{\zeta \log L_0} + \frac{\log\log L_0}{\zeta \log L_0}$ for large L_0, independently of k. This completes the proof since $L_0^{\alpha^k \zeta} \leq L_k^\zeta$. $\square$

In the following for $l \in \mathbb{N}$ we put

$$L = [l^\alpha] + 1,$$

$$M(\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}), E, m_l) = \#\{\text{distant cubes } \Lambda_l^{(n)} \subset \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ which are } (E, m_l)\text{-S}\}.$$

Lemma 8.2. *Let $E \in \mathbb{R}$, $J \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m_l > \frac{8nJK(n)}{l^{1-\beta}}$. Suppose that $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ is E-CNR and $M(\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x}), E, m_l) \leq J$. Then if l is large enough, $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ is $(E, m_L + L^{\beta-1})$-NS, with*

$$m_L \geq m_l - \left(\frac{16nJK(n)}{l^{\alpha-1}} m_l + \frac{3}{l^{\alpha(1-\beta)}}\right) > \frac{8nJK(n)}{L^{1-\beta}}.$$

Proof. We know there are at most J distant cubes $\Lambda_l^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}_{(j)}) \subset \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$ which are (E, m_l)-S. By Lemma 3.6 we may find $JK(n)$ cubes $\Lambda_{r_{n,l}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{z}^{(k)})$ such that if $\mathbf{v} \notin \bigcup_{k=1}^{JK(n)} \Lambda_{r_{n,l}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{z}^{(k)})$, then $\Lambda_l^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})$ is distant from all the $\Lambda_l^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}_{(j)})$. So using Lemma 3.2, we may construct disjoint cubes $\Lambda_{l_j}^{(n)}$ such that $l_j = n_j(r_{n,l} + 7)$, $\sum l_j \leq JK(n)(r_{n,l} + 7) := l_{n,J}$ and $\Lambda_l^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})$ is (E, m_l)-NS whenever $\mathbf{v} \in \Lambda_{L-l}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \setminus \bigcup_j \Lambda_{l_j-7}^{(n)}$. We first assume all the "bad cubes" $\Lambda_{l_j}^{(n)}$ are contained in $\Lambda_{L-l-7}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$. Note that if $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{B}_{L-l}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$ verifies $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{B}_{l_j}^{\text{out}} = \mathbf{B}_{l_j}^{(n)} \setminus \mathbf{B}_{l_j-6}^{(n)}$ for some j, then $\Lambda_l^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})$ is (E, m_l)-NS since in this case $\mathbf{v} \notin \Lambda_{l_j-7}^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{v} \notin \Lambda_{l_k-7}^{(n)}$ for $k \neq j$ (because $\mathbf{v} \in \Lambda_{l_j}^{(n)}$ and the cubes are disjoint).

Now fix $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{B}_L^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{x})$ and let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{L-l-7}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$. We have 2 cases:

(a) $\Lambda_l^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is (E, m_l)-NS. Then applying (GRI.2) to $\Lambda_l^{(n)} := \Lambda_l^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}; E)\| &\leq C \cdot |\mathbf{B}_l^{\text{out}}|^2 \max_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{B}_l^{\text{out}}} \|G_{\Lambda_l^{(n)}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{k}; E)\| \max_{\mathbf{k}' \in \mathbf{B}_l^{\text{out}}} \|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{k}', \mathbf{y}; E)\| \\ &\leq C_1(2l-1)^{2(nd-1)} e^{-m_l l} \|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{y}; E)\|\end{aligned}$$

for some $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathbf{B}_l^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{u})$.

(b) $\Lambda_l^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is (E, m_l)-S. In this case, $\mathbf{u} \in \Lambda_{l_j-7}^{(n)}$ for some j, so applying (GRI.2) to $\Lambda_{l_j}^{(n)}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}; E)\| &\leq C \cdot |\mathbf{B}_{l_j}^{\text{out}}|^2 \max_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{B}_{l_j}^{\text{out}}} \|G_{\Lambda_{l_j}^{(n)}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{k}; E)\| \max_{\mathbf{k}' \in \mathbf{B}_{l_j}^{\text{out}}} \|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{k}', \mathbf{y}; E)\| \\ &\leq C_2(2l_{n,J}-1)^{2(nd-1)} e^{l_{n,J}^\beta} \|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{y}; E)\|\end{aligned}$$

for some $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{B}_{l_j}^{\text{out}}$ because $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$ is E-CNR. But then $\Lambda_l^{(n)}(\mathbf{w})$ is (E, m_l)-NS, so applying (GRI.2) once more we get

$$\|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}; E)\| \leq C_3((2l_{n,J}-1)(2l-1))^{2(nd-1)} e^{l_{n,J}^\beta - m_l l} \|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{y}; E)\|$$

for some $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathbf{B}_l^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{w})$. Hence

$$\|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}; E)\| \leq e^{-m_l' l} \|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{y}; E), \|$$

where

$$m_l' = m_l - l^{-1}\{l_{n,J}^{\beta} + 2(nd-1)\log((2l_{n,J}-1)(2l-1)) + \log C_3\} > 0$$

because for large l,

$$l_{n,J} = JK(n)(2(4n-3)l + 4(n-1)r_0 + 7) \le (8n-5)JK(n)l$$

so that $m_l' \ge m_l - \frac{8nJK(n)}{l^{1-\beta}} > 0$ for l large enough.

Hence starting at $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{w}_0 := \mathbf{x}$, we may iterate the procedure p times as long as $\mathbf{w}_{p-1} \in \mathbf{B}^{(n)}_{L-l-7}(\mathbf{x})$. If (a) occurs n_+ times and (b) occurs $n_0 = p - n_+$ times, we obtain

$$\|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y};E)\| \le \big(C_1(2l-1)^{2(nd-1)}e^{-m_l l}\big)^{n_+} e^{-n_0 m_l' l}\|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{w}_p,\mathbf{y};E)\|.$$

In the case (a), $\mathbf{w}_k \in \mathbf{B}_l^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathbf{w}_{k-1})$, so each step cuts a length at most $l-1$. We thus have at least $n_+ = [\frac{L-2l_{n,J}-l-7}{l-1}]$, which is the worst scenario in which the iteration met all the bad cubes in its way, a total length of $2l_{n,J}$.

Now $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$ is E-NR and $e^{-n_0 m_l' l} \le 1$ since $m_l' > 0$. Hence

$$\|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y};E)\| \le \big(C_1(2l-1)^{2(nd-1)}e^{-m_l l}\big)^{n_+} e^{L^{\beta}} \le e^{-(m_L + L^{\beta-1})L},$$

where

$$(m_L + L^{\beta-1})L = -n_+\big(\log C_1 + 2(nd-1)\log(2l-1) - m_l l\big) - L^{\beta}. \tag{8-1}$$

Since $(\frac{L-2l_{n,J}-l-7}{l} - 1) \le n_+ \le \frac{L}{l-1}$, we get

$$m_L L \ge m_l(L - 2l_{n,J} - 2l - 7) - \frac{L}{l-1}(\log C_1 + 2(nd-1)\log(2l-1)) - 2L^{\beta}.$$

But $2l_{n,J} + 2l + 7 = ((16n-12)JK(n)+2)l + C(r_0,n,J) \le 16nJK(n)l$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} m_L L &\ge m_l L - 16nJK(n)m_l l - \frac{2ndL\log(2l-1)}{l-1} - 2L^{\beta} \\ &\ge m_l L - 16nJK(n)m_l l - \frac{L}{l^{\alpha(1-\beta)}} - 2L^{\beta} \end{aligned}$$

for large l, because $\alpha(1-\beta) = 3/4 < 1$. Noting that $L \ge l^{\alpha}$, we finally get

$$m_L \ge m_l - \frac{16nJK(n)}{l^{\alpha-1}}m_l - \frac{3}{l^{\alpha(1-\beta)}},$$

which proves the claim. Finally, if a bad cube lies completely outside $F := \Lambda^{(n)}_{L-l-7}(\mathbf{x})$, the situation is obviously better. If a bad cube is not contained in F but intersects F, we stop the iteration if we reach this bad cube. Then again the situation is better (because here only part of the length $2l_j$ of this cube is counted as bad). □

We now note that in the special case where $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$ contains only one bad cube, the hypotheses of Lemma 8.2 may be weakened to assume only that $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$ is E-NR. This will be of importance when analyzing PI cubes. The trick is to apply the GRI in both arguments of the operator kernel.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $E \in \mathbb{R}$, and $m_l > \frac{48nK(n)}{l^{1-\beta}}$. Suppose that $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ is E-NR and that $M(\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x}), E, m_l) \le 1$. Then if l is large enough, $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ is $(E, \tilde{m}_L + L^{\beta-1})$-NS, with*

$$\tilde{m}_L \ge m_l - \left(\frac{7}{l^{\alpha-1}} m_l + \frac{3}{l^{\alpha(1-\beta)}}\right).$$

Proof. Suppose first that there exists an (E, m_l)-S cube $\Lambda_l^{(n)}(\mathbf{z}) \subset \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$. Given $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{B}_L^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathbf{x})$, let $L_1 = \operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \Lambda_{2l}^{(n)}(\mathbf{z}))$ and $L_2 = \operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{y}, \Lambda_{2l}^{(n)}(\mathbf{z}))$. Starting from $\mathbf{w}_0 = \mathbf{x}$, we first iterate until arriving to within a distance $2l$ from $\mathbf{z}$. Reasoning as in Lemma 8.2, we get

$$\|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; E)\| \le \big(C_1(2l-1)^{2(nd-1)} e^{-m_l l}\big)^{n_1} \|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{w}_{n_1}, \mathbf{y}; E)\|,$$

where $n_1 = [\frac{L_1}{l-1}]$. Note that the safety layer $l+7$ is no longer needed here since we already have a layer of thickness $3l$ (assuming $3l \ge l+7$). We next regard $\mathbf{x}$ as belonging to $\mathbf{B}_L^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathbf{y})$ and iterate starting from $\mathbf{v}_0 = \mathbf{y}$, until arriving to within a distance $2l$ from $\mathbf{z}$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}\|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{w}_{n_1}, \mathbf{y}; E)\| &= \|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}_{n_1}; E)\| \\ &\le \big(C_1(2l-1)^{2(nd-1)} e^{-m_l l}\big)^{n_2} \|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{v}_{n_2}, \mathbf{w}_{n_1}; E)\|,\end{aligned}$$

where $n_2 = [\frac{L_2}{l-1}]$. Again the safety layer $l+7$ is not needed here. As $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$ is E-NR, we finally obtain

$$\|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; E)\| \le \big(C_1(2l-1)^{2(nd-1)} e^{-m_l l}\big)^{n_1+n_2} e^{L^\beta} \le e^{-(\tilde{m}_L + L^{\beta-1})L},$$

where

$$(\tilde{m}_L + L^{\beta-1})L = -(n_1+n_2)\big(\log C_1 + 2(nd-1)\log(2l-1) - m_l l\big) - L^\beta. \tag{8-2}$$

Since $L_1 + L_2 \ge d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - 4l$, we have $\frac{L-6l-6}{l} \le n_1 + n_2 \le \frac{L}{l-1}$. The bound on $\tilde{m}_L$ now follows as before. Finally, if there is no bad cube we may iterate $[\frac{L-l-7}{l-1}]$ times and get a better $\tilde{m}_L$. □

8.1. **Single-particle case.** We start by settling the 1-particle case.

Theorem 8.4. $(\mathsf{DS}: 1, k, m_{L_k}, I_1)$ *implies* $(\mathsf{DS}: 1, k+1, m_{L_{k+1}}, I_1)$.

Proof. Put $L = L_{k+1}$, $l = L_k$. In the 1-particle case, Hamiltonians corresponding to disjoint cubes are independent. Hence given a cube $\Lambda_L^{(1)}$ and $J \in 2\mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_1 : M(\Lambda_L^{(1)}, E, m_l) \ge J+1\} &\le \mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_1 : M(\Lambda_L^{(1)}, E, m_l) \ge J\} \\ &\le \mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_1 : M(\Lambda_L^{(1)}, E, m_l) \ge 2\}^{J/2} \\ &\le \big((2L)^{2d} l^{-2p_1(1+\theta)^k}\big)^{J/2} \\ &\le cL^{(d - \frac{p_1(1+\theta)^k}{\alpha})J} \le cL^{(\frac{p_1-1}{3} - \frac{2p_1(1+\theta)^k}{3})J}\end{aligned}$$

where we bound the number of pairs of cubes in $\Lambda_L^{(1)}$ by $|\mathbf{B}_L^{(1)}|^2 \le (2L)^{2d}$ and we used that $\alpha = 3/2$ and $d \le \frac{p_N-1}{3} \le \frac{p_1-1}{3}$. But

$$cL^{\frac{Jp_1}{3}(1-2(1+\theta)^k-\frac{1}{p_1})} \le \frac{1}{4} L^{\frac{Jp_1}{3}(1-2(1+\theta)^k-\theta)}$$

and since $(1-\theta) \le (1-\theta)(1+\theta)^k$ we have

$$1 - 2(1+\theta)^k - \theta \le -(1+\theta)^k - \theta(1+\theta)^k = -(1+\theta)^{k+1} \tag{8-3}$$

hence

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_1 : M(\Lambda_L^{(1)}, E, m_l) \ge J+1\} \le \frac{1}{4} L^{-Jp_1(1+\theta)^{k+1}/3}.$$

On the other hand, by $(\mathsf{W2}\colon 1, k+1, I_1)$ we have for any pair of distant cubes $\Lambda_L^{(1)}(u)$ and $\Lambda_L^{(1)}(v)$

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_1 : \Lambda_L^{(1)}(u) \text{ and } \Lambda_L^{(1)}(v) \text{ are not } E\text{-CNR}\} \le \frac{1}{4} L^{-2p_1(1+\theta)^{k+1}}.$$

The assertion now follows by applying Lemma 8.2 for $J = 6$ (note that l is large since L_0 is large and that if a cube is (E, m_L)-S, then it is $(E, m_L + L^{\beta-1})$-S). ☐

8.2. **Pairs of PI cubes.** Given $2 \le n \le N$, we are interested in the property

$$(\mathsf{DS1}\colon n, k, m_{L_k}, I_n) \; \begin{cases} \text{For all pairs of distant PI cubes } \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ and } \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) : \\ \mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ and } \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) \text{ are } (E, m_{L_k})\text{-S}\} \le L_k^{-2p_n(1+\theta)^k}. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 8.5. *Put $L = L_k$ and let $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u})$ be a decomposable cube with partition $\mathcal{J}$. Let $\Sigma' = \{\lambda_a\}$ and $\Sigma'' = \{\mu_b\}$ be the spectra of $H^{(n')}_{\Lambda_L(u_{\mathcal{J}})}$ and $H^{(n'')}_{\Lambda_L(u_{\mathcal{J}^c})}$ respectively, where $n' = \#\mathcal{J}$ and $n'' = n - n'$. Then given $E \in \mathbb{R}$, if*

- (i) *$\forall \mu_b \in \Sigma'' : \Lambda_L^{(n')}(u_{\mathcal{J}})$ is $(E - \mu_b, m + L^{\beta-1})$-NS,*
- (ii) *$\forall \lambda_a \in \Sigma' : \Lambda_L^{(n'')}(u_{\mathcal{J}^c})$ is $(E - \lambda_a, m + L^{\beta-1})$-NS,*

then $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u})$ is (E, m)-NS.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{B}_L^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{u})$, so $|u_{\mathcal{J}^c} - v_{\mathcal{J}^c}| \ge L - 6$ or $|u_{\mathcal{J}} - v_{\mathcal{J}}| \ge L - 6$. In the first case, we take a large $S > 2m$ and apply the first bound of $(\mathsf{GRI.3})$ to obtain

$$\|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; E)\| \le cL^{n'd} e^{-(m+L^{\beta-1})L} + c' L^{n'd} e^{-(L-6)S} \le e^{-mL}$$

since L_0 is large. In the second case we apply the second bound of $(\mathsf{GRI.3})$ and obtain the same result. ☐

Let $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ be a PI cube. By Lemma 3.5, it is decomposable so there exists $\mathcal{J}$ such that $H^{(n)}_{\Lambda_{L_k}(\mathbf{u})} = H^{(n')}_{\Lambda_{L_k}(u_{\mathcal{J}})} + H^{(n'')}_{\Lambda_{L_k}(u_{\mathcal{J}^c})}$. Let Σ' and Σ'' be the spectra of $H^{(n')}_{\Lambda_{L_k}(u_{\mathcal{J}})}$ and $H^{(n'')}_{\Lambda_{L_k}(u_{\mathcal{J}^c})}$ respectively. We say that $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is $(E, m_{L_{k-1}})$-*Non Tunneling* ($(E, m_{L_{k-1}})$-NT) if

- (i) $\forall \mu_b \in \Sigma'' : M(\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n')}(u_{\mathcal{J}}), E - \mu_b, m_{L_{k-1}}) \le 1$
- (ii) $\forall \lambda_a \in \Sigma' : M(\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n'')}(u_{\mathcal{J}^c}), E - \lambda_a, m_{L_{k-1}}) \le 1$

Otherwise, it said to be $(E, m_{L_{k-1}})$-*Tunneling* ($(E, m_{L_{k-1}})$-T).

Lemma 8.6. *Let $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u})$ be a PI cube. If $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u})$ is E-NR and $(E, m_{L_{k-1}})$-NT, then $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u})$ is (E, m_{L_k})-NS.*

Proof. Since $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is an E-NR PI cube, we have for all a, b :

$$e^{-L_k^\beta} \le |E - E_{a,b}| = |(E - \mu_b) - \lambda_a|,$$

hence $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n')}(u_{\mathcal{J}})$ is $(E - \mu_b)$-NR for all $\mu_b \in \Sigma''$. Now $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is $(E, m_{L_{k-1}})$-NT, thus $M(\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n')}(u_{\mathcal{J}}), E - \mu_b, m_{L_{k-1}}) \le 1$. Applying Lemma 8.3, we get that $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n')}(u_{\mathcal{J}})$ is $(E - \mu_b, \tilde{m}_{L_k} + L_k^{\beta-1})$-NS. A similar reasoning shows that $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n'')}(u_{\mathcal{J}^c})$ is $(E - \lambda_a, \tilde{m}_{L_k} + L_k^{\beta-1})$-NS for any $\lambda_a \in \Sigma'$. Taking $J = 6$ in Lemma 8.2, it is clear from (8-1) and (8-2) that $\tilde{m}_{L_k} \ge m_{L_k}$. We thus obtain the assertion by Lemma 8.5. $\square$

Lemma 8.7. *Let* $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u})$, $k \ge 1$ *be a PI cube and suppose* $(\mathsf{DS}: n', k-1, m_{L_{k-1}}, I_{n'})$ *holds for all* $n' < n$. *Then there exists* $C_1 = C_1(n, d, q_-)$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u}) \textit{ is } (E, m_{L_{k-1}})\textit{-T}\} \le C_1 L_k^{(2n-1)d - \frac{2p_{n-1}(1+\theta)^{k-1}}{\alpha}}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.5 there exists $\mathcal{J}$ such that $H_{\Lambda_{L_k}(\mathbf{u})}^{(n)} = H_{\Lambda_{L_k}(u_{\mathcal{J}})}^{(n')} + H_{\Lambda_{L_k}(u_{\mathcal{J}^c})}^{(n'')}$. Let Σ' and Σ'' be the spectra of $H_{\Lambda_{L_k}(u_{\mathcal{J}})}^{(n')}$ and $H_{\Lambda_{L_k}(u_{\mathcal{J}^c})}^{(n'')}$ respectively. Since $\mu_b \ge n''q_-$ for all $\mu_b \in \Sigma''$, given $E \in I_n$ and $\mu_b \in \Sigma''$ we have

$$E - \mu_b \le E - n''q_- \le (nq_- + \varepsilon_0) - n''q_- = n'q_- + \varepsilon_0.$$

Hence either $E - \mu_b \in [n'q_- - \frac{1}{2}, n'q_- + \varepsilon_0] = I_{n'}$, or $E - \mu_b < n'q_- - \frac{1}{2}$. Suppose $E - \mu_b < n'q_- - \frac{1}{2}$, let $\Lambda_{L_{k-1}}^{(n')}(v_1), \Lambda_{L_{k-1}}^{(n')}(v_2) \subset \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n')}(u_{\mathcal{J}})$ be two distant cubes and let $\eta_b = n'q_- - (E - \mu_b) > \frac{1}{2}$. Then by Combes-Thomas estimate, given $y_i \in B_{L_{k-1}}^{\mathrm{out}}(v_i)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|G_{\Lambda_{L_{k-1}}^{(n')}(v_i)}(v_i, y_i; E - \mu_b)\| &\le \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}\Big(\frac{\sqrt{L_{k-1}}}{\eta_b^{3/4}} + \frac{3}{8\sqrt{L_{k-1} - 8}\eta_b^{5/4}}\Big)e^{-(L_{k-1}-8)\sqrt{\eta_b}} \\ &\le e^{-m_{L_{k-1}}L_{k-1}}\end{aligned}$$

because $\sqrt{\eta_b} \ge 2m_{L_{k-1}}$ (in fact $\sqrt{\eta_b} \gg \frac{c}{L_0^{(1-\beta)/2}} = 2m_{L_0} \ge 2m_{L_{k-1}}$ for L_0 large enough). Thus both cubes are $(E, m_{L_{k-1}})$-NS in this case. On the other hand,

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists E - \mu_b \in I_{n'} : \Lambda_{L_{k-1}}^{(n')}(v_1) \text{ and } \Lambda_{L_{k-1}}^{(n')}(v_2) \text{ are } (E - \mu_b, m_{L_{k-1}})\text{-S}\} \le L_{k-1}^{-2p_{n'}(1+\theta)^{k-1}}$$

by $(\mathsf{DS}: n', k-1, m_{L_{k-1}}, I_{n'})$. But by Lemma 3.4, there exists $C = C(n, d, E - nq_- + \frac{1}{2})$ such that

$$b > C|\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n'')}(u_{\mathcal{J}^c})| \implies \mu_b > E - n'q_- + \tfrac{1}{2} \implies E - \mu_b < n'q_- - \tfrac{1}{2}.$$

As the number of pairs of cubes in $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n')}(u_{\mathcal{J}})$ is bounded by $|\mathbf{B}_{L_k}^{(n')}(u_{\mathcal{J}})|^2$, we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n, \exists \mu_b \in \Sigma'' \text{ such that } M(\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n')}(u_{\mathcal{J}}), E - \mu_b, m_{L_{k-1}}) \ge 2\} \\ &\le |\mathbf{B}_{L_k}^{(n')}(u_{\mathcal{J}})|^2 \sum_{b \le C|\Lambda^{(n'')}|} L_{k-1}^{-2p_{n'}(1+\theta)^{k-1}} \\ &\le \tilde{C} L_k^{2n'd + n''d} L_k^{\frac{-2p_{n'}(1+\theta)^{k-1}}{\alpha}} = \tilde{C} L_k^{(n+n')d - \frac{2p_{n'}(1+\theta)^{k-1}}{\alpha}} \le \frac{C_1}{2} L_k^{(2n-1)d - \frac{2p_{n-1}(1+\theta)^{k-1}}{\alpha}}\end{aligned}$$

because $p_{n'} \geq p_{n-1}$ for $n' = 1, \dots, n-1$. The same reasoning with the cube $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n'')}(u_{\mathcal{J}^c})$ and the spectrum $\Sigma' = \{\lambda_a\}$ of $H_{\Lambda_{L_k}(u_{\mathcal{J}})}^{(n')}$ yields the theorem. □

From now on we declare that

$$(\mathsf{DS} : n', -1, m_{L_{-1}}, I_{n'}) = \text{no assumption},$$

so that the following claims hold for $k \geq 0$.

Theorem 8.8. *Suppose that* $(\mathsf{DS}\colon n', k-1, m_{L_{k-1}}, I_{n'})$ *holds for all* $n' < n$ *and let* $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u})$ *and* $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{v})$ *be distant PI cubes. Then there exists* $C_2 = C_2(n, d, q_-)$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{u}) \text{ and } \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{v}) \text{ are } (E, m_{L_k})\text{-}S\} \leq C_2 L_k^{(2n-1)d - \frac{2p_{n-1}(1+\theta)^{k-1}}{\alpha}}.$$

In particular, $(\mathsf{DS1}\colon n, k, m_{L_k}, I_n)$ *holds.*

Proof. Suppose first $k \geq 1$. For $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$, taking $C_2 := 4C_1$, we have by Lemma 8.7

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ is } (E, m_{L_{k-1}})\text{-T}\} \leq \frac{C_2}{4} L_k^{(2n-1)d - \frac{2p_{n-1}(1+\theta)^{k-1}}{\alpha}}.$$

Furthermore, by $(\mathsf{W2}\colon n, k, I_n)$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ and } \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) \text{ are not } E\text{-NR}\} \leq \frac{C_2}{4} L_k^{(2n-1)d - \frac{2p_{n-1}(1+\theta)^{k-1}}{\alpha}}.$$

We thus obtain the bound by applying Lemma 8.6. If $k = 0$, note that L_0 is chosen so that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ and } \Lambda_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) \text{ are } (E, m_{L_0})\text{-}S\} \leq L_0^{-2p_1} \leq C_2 L_0^{(2n-1)d - \frac{2p_{n-1}}{\alpha(1+\theta)}}.$$

Finally, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
2p_n(1+\theta)^k &= (2p_n + 2\theta p_n)(1+\theta)^{k-1} \\
&< (2p_n + 2)(1+\theta)^{k-1} \\
&= \Big(\frac{2p_{n-1}}{\alpha^2(1+\theta)} - \frac{(2n-1)d}{\alpha} - 2nd\Big)(1+\theta)^{k-1} \qquad \text{(8-4)} \\
&< \Big(\frac{2p_{n-1}}{\alpha} - (2n-1)d\Big)(1+\theta)^{k-1} \\
&\leq \frac{2p_{n-1}(1+\theta)^{k-1}}{\alpha} - (2n-1)d, \qquad \text{(8-5)}
\end{aligned}$$

so in particular

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ and } \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) \text{ are } (E, m_{L_k})\text{-S}\} \leq L_k^{-2p_n(1+\theta)^k}.$$ □

8.3. **Pairs of FI cubes.** Given $2 \leq n \leq N$, we are interested in the property

$$(\mathsf{DS2}\colon n, k, m_{L_k}, I_n) \quad \begin{cases} \text{For all pairs of distant FI cubes } \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ and } \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) : \\ \mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ and } \Lambda_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) \text{ are } (E, m_{L_k})\text{-S}\} \leq L_k^{-2p_n(1+\theta)^k}. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 8.9. *Suppose that* $(\mathsf{DS2}\colon n, k, m_{L_k}, I_n)$ *and* $(\mathsf{DS}\colon n', k-1, m_{L_{k-1}}, I_{n'})$ *hold for* $n' < n$. *Then for any cube* $\Lambda_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{z})$ *and* $J \in 2\mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : M(\Lambda_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{z}), E, m_{L_k}) \geq J+1\} \leq \frac{1}{8}\big(L_{k+1}^{-2p_n(1+\theta)^{k+1}} + L_{k+1}^{-Jp_n(1+\theta)^{k+1}/3}\big).$$

Proof. Put $L = L_{k+1}$, $l = L_k$ and let M_1 (resp. M_2) be the number of distant PI (resp. FI) cubes $\Lambda_l^{(n)} \subset \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{z})$ which are (E, m_l)-S. Now suppose $M(\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{z}), E, m_l) \geq J+1$. Then either $M_1 \geq 2$ or $M_2 \geq J$. Furthermore, by Lemma 3.7, pairs of distant FI cubes are completely separated, so the corresponding Hamiltonians $H_{\Lambda_l}^{(n)}$ are independent. Since the number of pairs of cubes in $\Lambda_L^{(n)}$ is bounded by $|\mathbf{B}_L^{(n)}|^2 \leq (2L)^{2nd}$, we get using Theorem 8.8 and $(\mathsf{DS2}\colon n, k, m_l, I_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : M(\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{z}), E, m_l) \geq J+1\} \\
&\quad \leq \mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : M_1 \geq 2\} + \mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : M_2 \geq J\} \\
&\quad \leq C_2 (2L)^{2nd} l^{(2n-1)d - \frac{2p_{n-1}(1+\theta)^{k-1}}{\alpha}} + \mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : M_2 \geq 2\}^{J/2} \\
&\quad \leq cL^{2nd + \frac{(2n-1)d}{\alpha} - \frac{2p_{n-1}(1+\theta)^{k-1}}{\alpha^2}} + \left((2L)^{2nd} l^{-2p_n(1+\theta)^k}\right)^{J/2}
\end{aligned}$$

Now by (8-4),

$$\begin{aligned}
2p_n(1+\theta)^{k+1} &< \Big(\frac{2p_{n-1}}{\alpha^2(1+\theta)} - \frac{(2n-1)d}{\alpha} - 2nd\Big)(1+\theta)^k \\
&\leq \frac{2p_{n-1}(1+\theta)^{k-1}}{\alpha^2} - \frac{(2n-1)d}{\alpha} - 2nd,
\end{aligned}$$

hence $cL^{2nd + \frac{(2n-1)d}{\alpha} - \frac{2p_{n-1}(1+\theta)^{k-1}}{\alpha^2}} \leq \frac{1}{8} L^{-2p_n(1+\theta)^{k+1}}$. Furthermore,

$$\left((2L)^{2nd} l^{-2p_n(1+\theta)^k}\right)^{J/2} \leq cL^{(nd - \frac{p_n(1+\theta)^k}{\alpha})J} \leq cL^{(\frac{p_n - 1}{3} - \frac{2p_n(1+\theta)^k}{3})J}$$

because $\alpha = 3/2$ and $nd \leq \frac{p_N - 1}{3} \leq \frac{p_n - 1}{3}$. But

$$cL^{\frac{Jp_n}{3}(1 - 2(1+\theta)^k - \frac{1}{p_n})} \leq \frac{1}{8} L^{\frac{Jp_n}{3}(1 - 2(1+\theta)^k - \theta)},$$

which completes the proof by (8-3). □

Theorem 8.10. *$(\mathsf{DS}\colon n', k-1, m_{L_{k-1}}, I_{n'})$ for $n' < n$ and $(\mathsf{DS2}\colon n, k, m_{L_k}, I_n)$ imply $(\mathsf{DS2}\colon n, k+1, m_{L_{k+1}}, I_n)$.*

Proof. Put $L = L_{k+1}$, $l = L_k$. Let $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ and $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})$ be distant FI cubes. Then by Lemma 8.9, we have for $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$:

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : M(\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{z}), E, m_l) \geq 7\} \leq \frac{1}{4} L^{-2p_n(1+\theta)^{k+1}}.$$

Furthermore by $(\mathsf{W2}\colon n, k+1, I_n)$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ and } \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) \text{ are not } E\text{-CNR}\} \leq \frac{1}{4} L^{-2p_n(1+\theta)^{k+1}}.$$

The claim now follows by applying Lemma 8.2 for $J = 6$ (again l is large since L_0 is large). □

8.4. **Mixed pairs of cubes.** By a mixed pair of cubes, we mean that one cube is PI and the other is FI. Given $2 \le n \le N$, we are interested in the property

$$(\mathsf{DS3}\colon n,k,m_{L_k},I_n)\ \begin{cases}\text{For all mixed pairs of distant cubes } \Lambda^{(n)}_{L_k}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ and } \Lambda^{(n)}_{L_k}(\mathbf{v}): \\ \mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda^{(n)}_{L_k}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ and } \Lambda^{(n)}_{L_k}(\mathbf{v}) \text{ are } (E,m_{L_k})\text{-S}\} \le L_k^{-2p_n(1+\theta)^k}.\end{cases}$$

Theorem 8.11. $(\mathsf{DS}\colon n',k-1,m_{L_{k-1}},I_{n'})$, $(\mathsf{DS}\colon n',k,m_{L_k},I_{n'})$ *for* $n'<n$ *and* $(\mathsf{DS2}\colon n,k,m_{L_k},I_n)$ *imply* $(\mathsf{DS3}\colon n,k+1,m_{L_{k+1}},I_n)$.

Proof. Put $L=L_{k+1}$ and $l=L_k$. Let $\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{x})$ be FI and $\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{y})$ be PI, and assume they are distant. Put

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{x}) \text{ and } \Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{y}) \text{ are } (E,m_L)\text{-S}\},\\ T &= \{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{y}) \text{ is } (E,m_l)\text{-T}\},\\ R &= \{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{x}) \text{ and } \Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{y}) \text{ are not } E\text{-CNR}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(B) \le \mathbb{P}(T) + \mathbb{P}(B \cap T^c) \le \mathbb{P}(T) + \mathbb{P}(R) + \mathbb{P}(B \cap T^c \cap R^c).$$

In the event $B \cap T^c \cap R^c$, there exists $E \in I_n$ such that $\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{x})$ and $\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{y})$ are (E,m_L)-S but either $\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{x})$ or $\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{y})$ is E-CNR. Since $\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{y})$ is (E,m_l)-NT in this event, it must be the FI cube $\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{x})$ by Lemma 8.6. Hence

$$B \cap T^c \cap R^c \subseteq \{\exists E \in I_n : \Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{x}) \text{ is } E\text{-CNR and } (E,m_L)\text{-S}\}.$$

Since L_0 is large, taking $J=6$ we get by Lemma 8.2

$$B \cap T^c \cap R^c \subseteq \{\exists E \in I_n : M(\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{x}),E,m_l) \ge 7\}.$$

But by Lemma 8.9, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists E \in I_n : M(\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{x}),E,m_l) \ge 7\} \le \frac{1}{4} L^{-2p_n(1+\theta)^{k+1}}.$$

Thus by Lemma 8.7, (8-5) and $(\mathsf{W2}\colon n,k+1,I_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(B) &\le \mathbb{P}(T) + \mathbb{P}(R) + \mathbb{P}(B \cap T^c \cap R^c)\\ &\le \frac{1}{2}L^{-2p_n(1+\theta)^{k+1}} + \frac{1}{4}L^{-2p_n(1+\theta)^{k+1}} + \frac{1}{4}L^{-2p_n(1+\theta)^{k+1}}. \qquad \square\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 8.12 (Conclusion)**.** *There exists* $m>0$ *such that* $(\mathsf{DS}\colon N,k,m,I_N)$ *holds for all* $k \ge 0$.

Proof. By construction L_0 is a large integer such that $(\mathsf{DS}\colon n,0,m_{L_0},I_n)$ holds for all $1 \le n \le N$, with $m_{L_0} = \frac{1}{3L_0^{(1-\beta)/2}} > \frac{48nK(n)}{L_0^{1-\beta}}$. In particular, $(\mathsf{DSI}\colon n,0,m_{L_0},I_n)$ hold for all $n \le N$ and $I=1,2,3$. We shall prove the theorem by induction on n.

For $n=1$, we know that $(\mathsf{DS}\colon 1,k,m_{L_k},I_1)$ holds for all $k \ge 0$ by Theorem 8.4 and induction on k.

Suppose that $(\mathsf{DS}\colon n',k,m_{L_k},I_{n'})$ holds for all $k \ge 0$ and all $n'<n$. We may then apply Theorem 8.8 to obtain $(\mathsf{DS1}\colon n,k,m_{L_k},I_n)$ for all $k \ge 0$. Next apply Theorem 8.10 to obtain $(\mathsf{DS2}\colon n,k,m_{L_k},I_n)$ and finally Theorem 8.11 to obtain $(\mathsf{DS3}\colon n,k,m_{L_k},I_n)$ (recall that both theorems hold for $k \ge 0$ and that $(\mathsf{DS}\colon n',-1,m_{L_{-1}},I_{n'})$ means no assumption). We thus get $(\mathsf{DS}\colon n,k,m_{L_k},I_n)$ for all $k \ge 0$.

We thus showed that $(\mathsf{DS}\colon N,k,m_{L_k},I_N)$ holds for all $k\geq 0$. Now note that

$$S:=\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}(m_{L_j}-m_{L_{j+1}})\leq 96nK(n)\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\frac{m_{L_j}}{L_j^{\alpha-1}}+3\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{L_j^{\alpha(1-\beta)}}.$$

Since $m_{L_j}\leq m_{L_0}$ we have

$$S\leq 96nK(n)m_{L_0}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{L_0^{(\alpha-1)\alpha^j}}+3\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{L_0^{\alpha(1-\beta)\alpha^j}}\leq\frac{m_{L_0}}{2}\leq m_{L_0}-m$$

for any $0<m\leq\frac{m_{L_0}}{2}$, assuming L_0 is large enough. Now given $k\geq 1$, put $S_k:=\sum_{j=k}^{\infty}(m_{L_j}-m_{L_{j+1}})$. Again the m_{L_j} are decreasing, so $S_k\geq 0$ for all k. Since

$$m_{L_0}-m\geq S=m_{L_0}-m_{L_k}+S_k,$$

we get

$$m\leq m_{L_k}-S_k\leq m_{L_k}$$

so in particular, $(\mathsf{DS}\colon N,k,m,I_N)$ holds for all k. □

9. Generalized Eigenfunctions

In this section we prove a generalized eigenfunction expansion for $H^{(n)}(\omega)$ which plays an important role in the proof of localization. For this we show that our model verifies the general assumptions of [21, Section 3]. See also [4] for a detailed exposition.

Given a bounded potential $v=(v_\kappa)\geq 0$, we define the form $\mathfrak{h}_v$ by

$$\mathfrak{h}_v[f,g]=\sum_{\kappa\in\mathcal{K}}\mathfrak{a}_{v_\kappa}[f_\kappa,g_\kappa],\qquad D(\mathfrak{h}_v)=W^{1,2}(\Gamma),$$

where

$$\mathfrak{a}_{v_\kappa}[\phi,\psi]:=\langle\nabla\phi,\nabla\psi\rangle+\langle v_\kappa\phi,\psi\rangle,\qquad D(\mathfrak{a}_{v_\kappa})=W^{1,2}((0,1)^n).$$

We first show that $\mathfrak{h}_v$ is a Dirichlet form and that $(e^{-tH^{(n)}(\omega)})_{t\geq 0}$ is ultracontractive. For this we follow [31], as it covers the case where the Hilbert space is over $\mathbb{C}$.

Lemma 9.1. *$\mathfrak{h}_v$ is a Dirichlet form.*

Proof. Combine [31, Corollary 4.3], [31, Corollary 4.10] and [31, Theorem 2.25] to see that $p(D(\mathfrak{a}_{v_\kappa}))\subseteq D(\mathfrak{a}_{v_\kappa})$ and $\mathfrak{a}_{v_\kappa}[p\circ f]\leq\mathfrak{a}_{v_\kappa}[f]$ for every $f\in D(\mathfrak{a}_{v_\kappa})$ and every normal contraction p. Now let $u=(u_\kappa)\in D(\mathfrak{h}_v)$ such that $u_\kappa\in C([0,1]^n)$ for all κ and let p be a normal contraction. If $\sigma^i\equiv(0,1)^{n-1}$ is a common face to κ_1 and κ_2 and if $\gamma:W^{1,2}(0,1)^n\to L^2(0,1)^{n-1}$ is the trace operator, then

$$\begin{aligned}\|\gamma(p(u_{\kappa_1}))-\gamma(p(u_{\kappa_2}))\|_{L^2(0,1)^{n-1}}^2&=\|\gamma(p(u_{\kappa_1})-p(u_{\kappa_2}))\|_{L^2(0,1)^{n-1}}^2\\&=\int_{(0,1)^{n-1}}|p(u_{\kappa_1}(x))-p(u_{\kappa_2}(x))|^2dx\\&\leq\int_{(0,1)^{n-1}}|u_{\kappa_1}(x)-u_{\kappa_2}(x)|^2dx\\&=\|\gamma(u_{\kappa_1})-\gamma(u_{\kappa_2})\|_{L^2(0,1)^{n-1}}=0,\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds since u is continuous on σ^i. By the density of $C^\infty([0,1]^n)$ in $W^{1,2}((0,1)^n)$ and the continuity of γ and p, the same is true for all $u \in D(\mathfrak{h}_v)$. Hence $p \circ u$ is continuous on σ^i for all $u \in D(\mathfrak{h}_v)$. Thus $p(D(\mathfrak{h}_v)) \subseteq D(\mathfrak{h}_v)$. Furthermore,

$$\mathfrak{h}_v[p \circ u] = \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} \mathfrak{a}_{v_\kappa}[p \circ u_\kappa] \leq \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} \mathfrak{a}_{v_\kappa}[u_\kappa] = \mathfrak{h}_v[u].$$

Hence by [31, Theorem 2.25], $(e^{-tH_v})_{t\geq 0}$ is sub-Markovian, where H_v is the operator associated with $\mathfrak{h}_v$. Thus $\mathfrak{h}_v$ is a Dirichlet form. □

Lemma 9.2. *There exists $c = c(n) > 0$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$,*

$$\forall t > 0 : \|e^{-tH^{(n)}(\omega)}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)\to L^\infty(\Gamma)} \leq c t^{-n/4} e^{-(nq_- -1)t}. \tag{SG}$$

Proof. We prove the claim using a Nash-type inequality. By [26, Theorem 1, Section 1.4.8.], taking $p = 2$, $q = 2$, $j = 0$, $l = 1$ and $r = 1$, so that $\tau = \frac{n}{n+2}$ we have for any $u \in W^{1,2}(0,1)^n$,

$$\|u\|_{L^2(0,1)^n} \leq C(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(0,1)^n} + \|u\|_{L^1(0,1)^n})^{\frac{n}{n+2}} \cdot \|u\|_{L^1(0,1)^n}^{\frac{2}{n+2}}$$

By Hölder inequality and the fact that $(a+b)^2 \leq 2(a^2+b^2)$ for real a, b we get

$$\|u\|_{L^2(0,1)^n} \leq \tilde{C}(\mathfrak{a}_{v_\kappa}[u])^{\frac{n}{2(n+2)}} \cdot \|u\|_{L^1(0,1)^n}^{\frac{2}{n+2}}$$

for any bounded potential $v_\kappa \geq 1$. Thus given $f \in D(\mathfrak{h}_v) \cap L^1(\Gamma)$ we have

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 = \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} \|f_\kappa\|_{L^2(0,1)^n}^2 \leq \tilde{C}^2 \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} (\mathfrak{a}_{v_\kappa}[f_\kappa])^{\frac{n}{n+2}} \cdot \|f_\kappa\|_{L^1(0,1)^n}^{\frac{4}{n+2}}$$

Now let $(\mathfrak{a}_{v_\kappa}[f_\kappa])^{1/2} = a_\kappa$ and $\|f_\kappa\|_{L^1(0,1)^n} = b_\kappa$. We have

$$\sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} a_\kappa^{\frac{2n}{n+2}} \cdot b_\kappa^{\frac{4}{n+2}} = \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}} (a_\kappa \cdot b_\kappa^{\frac{2}{n}})^{\frac{2n}{n+2}} = \|ab^{\frac{2}{n}}\|_r^r$$

for $r = \frac{2n}{n+2}$, considering (a_κ), (b_κ) as elements of $L^r(\mathcal{K}, \#)$, with $\#$ the counting measure. Now we apply the generalized Hölder inequality, taking $p = 2$ and $q = n$ (which satisfies $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \|ab^{\frac{2}{n}}\|_r^r &\leq \left(\|a\|_2 \cdot \|b^{\frac{2}{n}}\|_n\right)^r = \left(\|a\|_2 \cdot \left(\sum |b_\kappa|^2\right)^{1/n}\right)^{\frac{2n}{n+2}} \\ &\leq \left(\|a\|_2 \cdot \left(\sum |b_\kappa|\right)^{2/n}\right)^{\frac{2n}{n+2}} = \left(\sum |a_\kappa|^2\right)^{\frac{n}{n+2}} \left(\sum |b_\kappa|\right)^{\frac{4}{n+2}} . \end{aligned}$$

We thus showed that

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 \leq \tilde{C}^2 \left(\sum \mathfrak{a}_{v_\kappa}[f_\kappa]\right)^{\frac{n}{n+2}} \left(\sum \|f_\kappa\|_{L^1(0,1)^n}\right)^{\frac{4}{n+2}} = \tilde{C}^2 \mathfrak{h}_v[f]^{\frac{n}{n+2}} \|f\|_{L^1(\Gamma)}^{\frac{4}{n+2}}$$

Thus,

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^{2+4/n} = \|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^{2(\frac{n+2}{n})} \leq c_1 \mathfrak{h}_v[f] \, \|f\|_{L^1(\Gamma)}^{4/n}.$$

By [31, Theorem 6.3], it follows by duality that

$$\forall t > 0 : \|e^{-tH_v}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)\to L^\infty(\Gamma)} \leq c t^{-n/4}.$$

The assertion follows by taking $v := V^\omega - (nq_- - 1) \geq 1$ and noting that

$$e^{-tH_v} = \exp(-t(H^{(n)}(\omega) - (nq_- - 1))) = e^{(nq_- -1)t} e^{-tH^{(n)}(\omega)}.$$ □

Let T be the self-adjoint operator on $L^2(\Gamma)$ given by $Tf(\mathbf{x}) = w(\mathbf{x})f(\mathbf{x})$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^{nd}$, where $w(\mathbf{x}) = (1 + \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2)^{\gamma/4}$ for some fixed $\gamma > nd + 1$. We may now establish

Lemma 9.3. *There exists $C = C(n)$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and $t > 0$:*

$$\operatorname{tr}(T^{-1}e^{-2tH^{(n)}(\omega)}T^{-1}) \le Ct^{-n/2}e^{-2(nq_- -1)t}\|w^{-1}\|_{L^2}^2 < \infty$$

Furthermore, the set function ν_ω on $\mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\nu_\omega(J) := \operatorname{tr}(T^{-1}E_\omega(J)T^{-1}) = \|E_\omega(J)T^{-1}\|_2^2$$

is a spectral measure for $H^{(n)}(\omega)$ which is finite for all bounded Borel sets J.

Proof. Divide Γ into annuli $(\Lambda_{k+1}^{(n)}(\mathbf{0}) \setminus \Lambda_k^{(n)}(\mathbf{0})) \cap \Gamma$, then

$$\int_\Gamma |w^{-1}|^2 dm \le \sum_k \frac{m(\Lambda_{k+1}^{(n)}(\mathbf{0}) \cap \Gamma)}{(1+k^2)^{\gamma/2}} \le C \sum_k \frac{(k+1)^{nd}}{(1+k^2)^{\gamma/2}} < \infty.$$

Thus $w^{-1} \in L^2$ and T^{-1} is an operator from $L^\infty(\Gamma) \to L^2(\Gamma)$. Put $H := H^{(n)}(\omega)$. Then by (SG), $T^{-1}e^{-tH} : L^2 \to L^2$ factorizes through L^∞. By the Factorisation Principle (see [37, Section 4.1.11] and [25] for a proof), $T^{-1}e^{-tH}$ is thus Hilbert-Schmidt and

$$\|T^{-1}e^{-tH}\|_2 \le K_G \|T^{-1}\|_{L^\infty \to L^2} \|e^{-tH}\|_{L^2 \to L^\infty} \le c' t^{-n/4} e^{-(nq_- -1)t} \|w^{-1}\|_{L^2}$$

where K_G, the *Grothendieck constant*, is a universal constant. Thus $e^{-tH}T^{-1} = (T^{-1}e^{-tH})^*$ is also a Hilbert-Schmidt operator with the same norm. Thus

$$\operatorname{tr}(T^{-1}e^{-2tH}T^{-1}) = \|e^{-tH}T^{-1}\|_2^2 \le Ct^{-n/2}e^{-2(nq_- -1)t}\|w^{-1}\|_{L^2}^2$$

as asserted. The fact that ν_ω is a measure is standard; see [4]. Now $e^{-2\lambda} \ge e^{-2b}$ on J, where $b := \sup\{\lambda \in J\}$, hence

$$0 \le e^{-2b}E_\omega(J) \le \int_J e^{-2\lambda} dE_\omega(\lambda) \le \int_{\sigma(H)} e^{-2\lambda} dE_\omega(\lambda) = e^{-2H}.$$

Hence $\nu_\omega(J) \le e^{2b} \operatorname{tr}(T^{-1}e^{-2H}T^{-1}) \le C_J \|w^{-1}\|_{L^2}^2$. Finally, $\nu_\omega(J) = 0 \iff E_\omega(J) = 0$, so ν_ω is a spectral measure for H. ☐

We note in passing that given a bounded interval I, the previous proof yields a constant $C = C(I, n, q_-) > 0$ independent of ω such that

$$\sup_\omega \nu_\omega(I) \le C\|w^{-1}\|_{L^2}^2 := C_{\mathrm{tr}} \tag{9-1}$$

Let $\mathcal{H}_+$ be the space $D(T)$ equipped with the norm $\|\phi\| = \|T\phi\|$ and $\mathcal{H}_-$ the completion of $\mathcal{H}$ in the norm $\|\psi\|_- = \|T^{-1}\psi\|$. By construction $\mathcal{H}_+ \subset \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}_-$ is then a triple of Hilbert spaces with natural injections $\iota_+ : \mathcal{H}_+ \to \mathcal{H}$ and $\iota_- : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}_-$ continuous with dense range. The inner product $\langle\, , \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ extends to a sesquilinear form on $\mathcal{H}_+ \times \mathcal{H}_-$ which turns $\mathcal{H}_+$ and $\mathcal{H}_-$ into conjugate duals (see [33, Lemma 1] and [4]). The adjoint of an operator O with respect to this duality is denoted by $O^\dagger$. We note the following.

Lemma 9.4. *For all $\omega \in \Omega$, the space*

$$\mathcal{D}_+ = \{f \in D(H^{(n)}(\omega)) \cap \mathcal{H}_+ : H^{(n)}(\omega)f \in \mathcal{H}_+\}$$

is dense in $\mathcal{H}_+$ and is an operator core for $H^{(n)}(\omega)$.

Proof. We first note that $D(H^{(n)}) \cap C_c(\Gamma)$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}_+$. Indeed, given $f \in \mathcal{H}_+$, $Tf \in L^2(\Gamma)$ may be approximated by functions $g_j \in D(H^{(n)}) \cap C_c(\Gamma)$, hence $\|f - T^{-1}g_j\|_+ \to 0$ and clearly $T^{-1}g_j \in D(H^{(n)}) \cap C_c(\Gamma)$. Since any $f \in D(H^{(n)}) \cap C_c(\Gamma)$ has $H^{(n)}f$ of compact support and hence in $\mathcal{H}_+$, it follows that $\mathcal{D}_+$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}_+$.

To show that $\mathcal{D}_+$ is a core we follow [7, Proposition 2.4]: let $E < nq_-$ and consider $D_0 = (H^{(n)} - E)^{-1}C_c(\Gamma)$. Since $C_c(\Gamma)$ is dense in $L^2(\Gamma)$, D_0 is a core for $H^{(n)}$. By the Combes-Thomas estimate, each $f \in D_0$ is exponentially decreasing. Hence $f \in \mathcal{H}_+$ and

$$H^{(n)}f = (H^{(n)} - E)f + Ef = \varphi + Ef \in \mathcal{H}_+$$

since $f = (H^{(n)} - E)^{-1}\varphi$ for some $\varphi \in C_c(\Gamma)$. This proves the assertion. $\square$

If follows by [21, Lemma 3.1] that $H^{(n)}(\omega)$, regarded as an operator on $\mathcal{H}_-$, is closable and densely defined. We denote its closure by $H_-^{(n)}(\omega)$. We then say $\psi \in \mathcal{H}_-$ is a *generalized eigenfunction* of $H^{(n)}(\omega)$ if ψ is an eigenfunction of $H_-^{(n)}(\omega)$, i.e. if $\psi \in D(H_-^{(n)}(\omega))$ and $H_-^{(n)}(\omega)\psi = \lambda\psi$ for some *generalized eigenvalue* λ.

By [21, Lemma 3.2], we have $H_-^{(n)}(\omega)\psi = H^{(n)}(\omega)\psi$ for any $\psi \in D(H_-^{(n)}) \cap \mathcal{H}$. In particular, if a generalized eigenfunction lies in $\mathcal{H}$, then it is an eigenfunction.

We may now state the main result of this section. In the following we denote by $\mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{H}_+, \mathcal{H}_-)$ the space of trace class operators from $\mathcal{H}_+$ to $\mathcal{H}_-$ (see [21] for details).

Theorem 9.5. *There exists a ν_ω-locally integrable function $P_\omega : \mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{H}_+, \mathcal{H}_-)$ such that*

$$\iota_- f(H^{(n)}(\omega))E_\omega(J)\iota_+ = \int_J f(\lambda)P_\omega(\lambda)d\nu_\omega(\lambda)$$

for all bounded Borel sets J and all bounded Borel functions f, where the integral is the Bochner integral of $\mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{H}_+, \mathcal{H}_-)$-valued functions. Furthermore, for ν_ω-almost every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$P_\omega(\lambda) = P_\omega(\lambda)^\dagger, \qquad \operatorname{tr} P_\omega(\lambda) = 1$$

and $P_\omega(\lambda)\phi \in \mathcal{H}_-$ is a generalized eigenfunction of $H^{(n)}(\omega)$ with generalized eigenvalue λ for any $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_+$.

Proof. Applying [21, Theorem 3.1] and [21, Corollary 3.1], it only remains to show that $P_\omega(\lambda) = P_\omega(\lambda)^\dagger$ ν_ω-a.e. This follows from [21, Eq.(46)] and the fact that $\iota_+^\dagger = \iota_-$. $\square$

10. Exponential Localization

The fundamental link between mutiscale analysis and localization is provided by the following eigenfunction decay inequality. Since we will not rely on regularity of generalized eigenfunctions, the proof is a bit longer than usual.

Lemma 10.1. *Given a bounded interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, there exists $C = C(I, n, d, q_-)$ such that, if $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$ and $\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{x}) \subset \Lambda_{L-6}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}_0)$, then every generalized eigenfunction ψ of $H^{(n)}$ corresponding to $\lambda \in I \cap \rho(H_{\Lambda_L(\mathbf{x}_0)}^{(n)})$ satisfies*

$$\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi\| \le C \cdot |\mathbf{B}_L^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathbf{x}_0)| \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{B}_L^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \|G_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}_0)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \lambda)\| \cdot \|\chi_{\Lambda_L^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathbf{x}_0)}\psi\|.$$

Proof. Let $\Lambda := \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ and $\varphi \in \tilde{C}_c^1(\Gamma \cap \Lambda)$ such that $\varphi = 1$ on a neighborhood of $\Gamma \cap \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{x})$, $\operatorname{supp} \nabla\varphi \subset \tilde{\Omega} := \operatorname{int}(\Lambda_{L-2}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}_0) \setminus \Lambda_{L-4}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}_0))$, and $\|\nabla\varphi\|_\infty \le C_1(nd)$. Then

$$\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi\|^2 = \langle \varphi\psi, \chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi\rangle = \langle \varphi\psi, (H_\Lambda - \lambda)G_\Lambda(\lambda)\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi\rangle.$$

Put $H := H^{(n)}(\omega)$. Since $\psi \in D(H_-)$ and H_- is the closure of H, there exists (f_j) in $D(H)$ such that $\|f_j - \psi\|_- \to 0$ and $\|Hf_j - H_-\psi\|_- \to 0$. Now for any χ of compact support we have

$$\|\chi f_j - \chi\psi\| \le \|\chi w\| \cdot \|f_j - \psi\|_- \to 0 \tag{10-1}$$

(recall that $Tg := wg$). Hence taking $v := G_\Lambda(\lambda)\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi$ we have

$$\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi\|^2 = \lim_{j\to\infty} \langle \varphi f_j, (H_\Lambda - \lambda)v\rangle = \lim_{j\to\infty} (\mathfrak{h}_\Lambda - \lambda)[\varphi f_j, v]$$

since $\varphi f_j \in D(\mathfrak{h}_\Lambda)$ by Lemma 4.1. Now

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathfrak{h}_\Lambda - \lambda)[\varphi f_j, v] &= \langle \nabla(\varphi f_j), \nabla v\rangle + \langle (V^\omega - \lambda)\varphi f_j, v\rangle \\ &= \big[\langle \nabla f_j, \nabla(\varphi v)\rangle + \langle (V^\omega - \lambda) f_j, \varphi v\rangle\big] + \langle f_j \nabla\varphi, \nabla v\rangle - \langle \nabla f_j, v\nabla\varphi\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\varphi v \in W^{1,2}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda)$ has compact support in Λ, we may extend it by zero to a function g in $D(\mathfrak{h}) \cap C_c(\Gamma)$. Hence

$$(\mathfrak{h}_\Lambda - \lambda)[\varphi f_j, v] = \langle (H-\lambda) f_j, g\rangle + \langle f_j\nabla\varphi, \nabla v\rangle - \langle \nabla f_j, v\nabla\varphi\rangle \tag{10-2}$$

Now $H_-\psi = \lambda\psi$, so by the choice of f_j

$$\|(H-\lambda)f_j\|_- \le \|Hf_j - \lambda\psi\|_- + |\lambda| \cdot \|f_j - \psi\|_- \to 0. \tag{10-3}$$

Thus

$$|\langle (H-\lambda)f_j, g\rangle| \le \|(H-\lambda)f_j\|_- \|g\|_+ \to 0.$$

The second term in (10-2) tends to $\langle \psi\nabla\varphi, \nabla v\rangle$ by (10-1). For the third term, note that by Lemma 5.3, taking $\Omega := \operatorname{int} \Lambda_L^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{x}_0)$, we can find c_1 such that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\chi_{\tilde{\Omega}} \nabla f_j\| &\le c_1(\|\chi_\Omega (H-\lambda) f_j\| + \|\chi_\Omega f_j\|) \\ &\le c_1(\|\chi_\Omega w\| \cdot \|(H-\lambda)f_j\|_- + \|\chi_\Omega\psi\| + j^{-1})\end{aligned}$$

for large j, by (10-1). This tends to $c_1\|\chi_\Omega\psi\|$ by (10-3).

Recalling that $\operatorname{supp}\nabla\varphi \subset \tilde{\Omega}$, the above derivation finally yields

$$\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi\|^2 \le \|\nabla\varphi\|_\infty \|\chi_{\tilde{\Omega}}\psi\| \|\chi_{\tilde{\Omega}}\nabla v\| + c_1 \|\nabla\varphi\|_\infty \|\chi_\Omega\psi\| \|\chi_{\tilde{\Omega}} v\|$$

By Lemma 5.3, we can find c_2 such that

$$\|\chi_{\tilde{\Omega}}\nabla v\| \le c_2 \|\chi_\Omega v\|$$

(note that $(H_\Lambda - \lambda)v = \chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi = 0$ on Ω). Taking $C = \max(2c_1\|\nabla\varphi\|_\infty, 2c_2\|\nabla\varphi\|_\infty)$ and noting that $\tilde{\Omega} \subset \Omega \subset \Lambda_L^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ we thus get

$$\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi\|^2 \le C \cdot \|\chi_{\Lambda_L^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{x}_0)}\psi\| \cdot \|\chi_{\Lambda_L^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{x}_0)} v\|.$$

Since $\|\chi_{\Lambda_L^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{x}_0)} v\| \le \|\chi_{\Lambda_L^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{x}_0)} G_\Lambda(E)\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\| \|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi\|$, we get

$$\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi\| \le C \cdot \|\chi_{\Lambda_L^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{x}_0)} G_\Lambda(\lambda)\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\| \cdot \|\chi_{\Lambda_L^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{x}_0)}\psi\|.$$

The assertion now follows by the triangle inequality. □

We now prove exponential localization by adapting [11, Theorem 2.3] to our setting.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Choose m and ε_0 as in Theorem 8.12 and let σ_{gen} be the set of generalized eigenvalues of $H^{(N)}$. By Theorem 9.5 there exists $A_0 \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $\nu_\omega(A_0) = 1$ such that $A_0 \subseteq \sigma_{\text{gen}}$. If we show that every $\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{gen}} \cap I$ is an eigenvalue, $A_0 \cap I$ will be countable (as $L^2(\Gamma)$ is separable), so $\nu_\omega|_I$ will be concentrated on a countable set and $\sigma(H^{(N)}) \cap I$ will be pure point. It thus suffices to show that with probability one the generalized eigenfunctions of $H^{(N)}$ corresponding to $\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{gen}} \cap I$ decay exponentially with mass m.

Let $b \in \mathbb{N}$ to be chosen later. Given $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}$, define

$$A_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{K(N)} \big(\mathbf{B}^{(N)}_{br_{N,L_{k+1}}}(\mathbf{x}_0^{(j)}) \setminus \mathbf{B}^{(N)}_{r_{N,L_k}}(\mathbf{x}_0^{(j)})\big),$$

where $\mathbf{B}^{(N)}_{r_{N,L_k}}(\mathbf{x}_0^{(j)}) = \Lambda^{(N)}_{r_{N,L_k}}(\mathbf{x}_0^{(j)}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}$ are the $K(N)$ cubes given by Lemma 3.6. Then any $\mathbf{x} \in A_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ verifies that $\Lambda^{(N)}_{L_k}(\mathbf{x})$ is distant from $\Lambda^{(N)}_{L_k}(\mathbf{x}_0)$. We now define the event

$$E_k(\mathbf{x}_0) = \{\exists \lambda \in I, \mathbf{x} \in A_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}_0) : \Lambda^{(N)}_{L_k}(\mathbf{x}_0) \text{ and } \Lambda^{(N)}_{L_k}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ are } (\lambda, m)\text{-S}\}.$$

By Theorem 8.12, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(E_k(\mathbf{x}_0)) \le K(N)(2br_{N,L_{k+1}} - 1)^{Nd} L_k^{-2p_N(1+\theta)^k} \le cL_k^{N\alpha d - 2p_N(1+\theta)^k}$$

Hence $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(E_k(\mathbf{x}_0)) < \infty$. So by the Borel-Cantelli Lemma and the countability of $\mathbb{Z}^{Nd}$ we get

$$\mathbb{P}\{\,\exists\, \mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd} : E_k(\mathbf{x}_0) \text{ occurs infinitely often}\} = 0.$$

So if we take the event

$$\Omega_1 = \{\,\forall\, \mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd} : E_k(\mathbf{x}_0) \text{ occurs finitely often}\},$$

we have $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_1) = 1$. Now let $\omega \in \Omega_1$ and $\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{gen}}(H^{(N)}(\omega)) \cap I$ correspond to a generalized eigenfunction ψ. If $\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi\| = 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}$, then $\psi = 0$ and the theorem holds. So suppose $\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}_0}\psi\| \neq 0$ for some $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}$. Then by Lemma 10.1 we may find $C_1 = C_1(N, d, q_-, \gamma, \|\psi\|_-)$ such that

$$\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}_0}\psi\| \le C_1 \cdot |\mathbf{B}^{\text{out}}_{L_k}(\mathbf{x}_0)| \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{B}^{\text{out}}_{L_k}(\mathbf{x}_0)} \|G_{\Lambda^{(N)}_{L_k}(\mathbf{x}_0)}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}; \lambda)\| \cdot (1 + (|\mathbf{x}_0| + L_k)^2)^{\gamma/4}.$$

Now if $\Lambda^{(N)}_{L_k}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ is (λ, m)-NS, we get

$$\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}_0}\psi\| \le C_1' L_k^{Nd-1} e^{-mL_k} (1 + (|\mathbf{x}_0| + L_k)^2)^{\gamma/4}.$$

Since $\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}_0}\psi\| \neq 0$, there exists k_1 such that $\Lambda^{(N)}_{L_k}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ is (λ, m)-S for all $k \ge k_1$. But as $\omega \in \Omega_1$, we may find k_2 such that $E_k(\mathbf{x}_0)$ does not occur if $k \ge k_2$. Let $k_3 = \max(k_1, k_2)$. Then for $k \ge k_3$, we conclude that $\Lambda^{(N)}_{L_k}(\mathbf{x})$ is (λ, m)-NS for all $\mathbf{x} \in A_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}_0)$.

Now given $0 < \rho < 1$, we choose $b > \frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho}$ and define

$$\tilde{A}_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{K(N)} \big(\mathbf{B}^{(N)}_{\frac{b}{1+\rho} r_{N,L_{k+1}}}(\mathbf{x}_0^{(j)}) \setminus \mathbf{B}^{(N)}_{\frac{1}{1-\rho} r_{N,L_k}}(\mathbf{x}_0^{(j)})\big).$$

Then $\tilde{A}_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}_0) \subset A_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ and for any $\mathbf{x} \in \tilde{A}_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}_0)$, we have

$$\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \partial A_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}_0)) \ge \rho \min_{1 \le j \le K(N)} |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0^{(j)}| := \rho |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0^{(j_0)}|.$$

Now for $\mathbf{x} \in \tilde{A}_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ with $k \geq k_3$, $\Lambda_{L_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})$ is (λ, m)-NS, so by Lemma 10.1,

$$\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi\| \leq C_2 L_k^{2(Nd-1)} e^{-mL_k} \|\chi_{\mathbf{w}_1}\psi\|$$

for some $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathbf{B}_{L_k}^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathbf{x})$. We may iterate at least $[\frac{\rho|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_0^{(j_0)}|}{L_k-1}]$ times and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi\| &\leq (C_2 L_k^{2(Nd-1)} e^{-mL_k})^{[\frac{\rho|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_0^{(j_0)}|}{L_k-1}]} C_3 \|\psi\|_- (1 + (|\mathbf{x}_0| + bL_{k+1})^2)^{\gamma/4} \\ &\leq e^{-m\rho'\rho|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_0^{(j_0)}|}\end{aligned}$$

for any $0 < \rho' < 1$, provided $k \geq k_4$ for some $k_4 \geq k_3$. But if $\mathbf{x} \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{K(N)} \mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{1-\rho} r_{N,L_{k_4}}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}_0^{(j)})$, then $\mathbf{x} \in \tilde{A}_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ for some $k \geq k_4$ (since $\frac{b}{1+\rho} r_{N,L_{k+1}} > \frac{1}{1-\rho} r_{N,L_{k+1}}$) and the bound is satisfied. Thus, choosing an arbitrary $\mathbf{x}_0$ in which $\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}_0} u\| \neq 0$, we have

$$\log \|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi\| \leq -m\rho'\rho \cdot |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0^{(j_0)}|$$

whenever $\mathbf{x} \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{K(N)} \mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{1-\rho} r_{N,L_{k_4}}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}_0^{(j)})$. As $\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_0^{(j_0)}|}{|\mathbf{x}|} \to 1$ when $|\mathbf{x}| \to \infty$, we get

$$\limsup_{|\mathbf{x}|\to\infty} \frac{\log \|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi\|}{|\mathbf{x}|} \leq -m\rho'\rho$$

for all $\rho, \rho' \in (0,1)$, which completes the proof of the theorem. ☐

11. DYNAMICAL LOCALIZATION

We finally establish dynamical localization using the approach of [15]. In the following we consider the event

$$R(m, L, I, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := [\,\forall \lambda \in I : \Lambda_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ or } \Lambda_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{y}) \text{ is } (\lambda, m)\text{-NS}\,]$$

for $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{y}$ such that the corresponding cubes are distant. We start with the following key lemma.

Lemma 11.1. *Let $m > 0$, $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and assume $\omega \in R(m, L, I, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$. Then*

$$\|\chi_{\boldsymbol{x}} P_\omega(\lambda) \chi_{\boldsymbol{y}}\|_2 \leq Ce^{-mL/2}(1 + |\boldsymbol{x}|)^{\gamma/2}(1 + |\boldsymbol{y}|)^{\gamma/2}$$

for ν_ω-a.e. $\lambda \in I$ and large L, with $C = C(I, m, N, d, \gamma, q_-) < \infty$.

Proof. Let A_0 be the set with $\nu_\omega(A_0) = 1$ such that Theorem 9.5 holds for all $\lambda \in A_0$. Given $\lambda \in I \cap A_0$, either $\Lambda_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})$ or $\Lambda_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{y})$ is (λ, m)-NS. Since $P_\omega(\lambda) = P_\omega(\lambda)^\dagger$, we have $\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}} P_\omega(\lambda) \chi_{\mathbf{y}}\|_2 = \|\chi_{\mathbf{y}} P_\omega(\lambda) \chi_{\mathbf{x}}\|_2$, so we may assume that $\Lambda_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})$ is (λ, m)-NS. Now if $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$, then by Theorem 9.5, the vector $P_\omega(\lambda)\chi_{\mathbf{y}}\phi$ is a generalized eigenfunction of $H^{(N)}(\omega)$, hence by Lemma 10.1,

$$\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}} P_\omega(\lambda) \chi_{\mathbf{y}} \phi\| \leq C_1 (2L-1)^{Nd-1} e^{-mL} \|\chi_{\Lambda_L^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathbf{x})} P_\omega(\lambda) \chi_{\mathbf{y}} \phi\|$$

Hence by definition of the HS norm,

$$\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}} P_\omega(\lambda) \chi_{\mathbf{y}}\|_2 \leq C_1 (2L-1)^{Nd-1} e^{-mL} \|\chi_{\Lambda_L^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathbf{x})} P_\omega(\lambda) \chi_{\mathbf{y}}\|_2$$

But

$$\begin{aligned}\|\chi_{\Lambda_L^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathbf{x})}P_\omega(\lambda)\chi_{\mathbf{y}}\|_1 &\le \|\chi_{\Lambda_L^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathbf{x})}\|_{\mathcal{H}_-\to\mathcal{H}}\|P_\omega(\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{H}_+,\mathcal{H}_-)}\|\chi_{\mathbf{y}}\|_{\mathcal{H}\to\mathcal{H}_+}\\ &\le c(1+(|\mathbf{x}|+L)^2)^{\gamma/4}(1+(|\mathbf{y}|+1)^2)^{\gamma/4}\end{aligned}$$

since $\operatorname{tr} P_\omega(\lambda)=1$. The claim follows since $\|\cdot\|_2\le\|\cdot\|_1$. $\square$

We now establish the decay of the operator kernel. Given a bounded K as in the statement of Theorem 1.2, we find $k_0>0$ such that $K\subset\Gamma\cap\Lambda^{(N)}_{r_{N,L_{k_0}}}(\mathbf{0})$. For $j\ge k_0$ put

$$\begin{aligned} F_j&=\Lambda^{(N)}_{2r_{N,L_j}}(\mathbf{0}), & \tilde F_j&=\mathbf{B}^{(N)}_{2r_{N,L_j}}(\mathbf{0}),\\ M_j&=F_{j+1}\setminus F_j, & \tilde M_j&=\tilde F_{j+1}\setminus\tilde F_j.\end{aligned}$$

In the following, m and ε_0 are as in Theorem 8.12.

Lemma 11.2. *There exists $c=c(N,d,q_-,r_0,\gamma)$ such that for $\boldsymbol{x}\in\tilde M_j$ and $\boldsymbol{y}\in\boldsymbol{B}^{(N)}_{r_{N,L_j}}(\boldsymbol{0})$ with j large enough, we have for $I=[Nq_-,Nq_-+\varepsilon_0]$:*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\sup_{\|f\|\le1}\|\chi_{\boldsymbol{x}}f(H^{(N)}(\omega))E_\omega(I)\chi_{\boldsymbol{y}}\|_2^2\Big)\le c(e^{-mL_j/2}+L_j^{-2p_N(1+\theta)^j+\gamma}).$$

Proof. Given a bounded Borel f put $f_I:=f\chi_I$ and $H_\omega:=H^{(N)}(\omega)$. By Theorem 9.5 and standard properties of the Bochner integral in the space of HS operators we have

$$\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}f_I(H_\omega)\chi_{\mathbf{y}}\|_2\le\int_I|f(\lambda)|\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}P_\omega(\lambda)\chi_{\mathbf{y}}\|_2\,d\nu_\omega(\lambda).$$

Since $\mathbf{x}\in\tilde M_j$ and $\mathbf{y}\in\mathbf{B}^{(N)}_{r_{N,L_j}}(\mathbf{0})$, we know by Lemma 3.6 that $\Lambda^{(N)}_{L_j}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\Lambda^{(N)}_{L_j}(\mathbf{y})$ are distant. Hence if $\omega\in B_j:=R(m,L_j,I,\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$, we have by Lemma 11.1

$$\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}P_\omega(\lambda)\chi_{\mathbf{y}}\|_2\le C_1L_{j+1}^{\gamma/2}L_j^{\gamma/2}e^{-mL_j/2}\le e^{-mL_j/4}$$

for ν_ω-a.e. $\lambda\in I$ and j large enough. Hence

$$\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}f_I(H_\omega)\chi_{\mathbf{y}}\|_2\le\|f\|_\infty e^{-mL_j/4}\nu_\omega(I)\le C_{\mathrm{tr}}\|f\|_\infty e^{-mL_j/4}$$

where $C_{\mathrm{tr}}=C_{\mathrm{tr}}(N,d,q_-,\gamma)$ is given by (9-1). For $\omega\in B_j^c$ we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}f_I(H_\omega)\chi_{\mathbf{y}}\|_2^2&\le\|f\|_\infty^2\|E_\omega(I)\chi_{\mathbf{y}}\|_2^2\\ &\le\|f\|_\infty^2\|\chi_{\mathbf{y}}T\|^2\|E_\omega(I)T^{-1}\|_2^2\le C_2\|f\|_\infty^2L_j^\gamma\nu_\omega(I)\end{aligned}$$

for $C_2=C_2(\gamma,N,d,r_0)$. Again $\nu_\omega(I)\le C_{\mathrm{tr}}$, so we finally get

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\sup_{\|f\|\le1}\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}}f_I(H_\omega)\chi_{\mathbf{y}}\|_2^2\Big)\le C_{\mathrm{tr}}^2e^{-mL_j/2}\,\mathbb{P}(B_j)+C_2C_{\mathrm{tr}}L_j^\gamma\,\mathbb{P}(B_j^c).$$

Using Theorem 8.12 to estimate $\mathbb{P}(B_j^c)$, we obtain the assertion. $\square$

We are finally ready to prove our main result. Note that if R is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator on $L^2(\Gamma)$ and if $A,B\subset\mathbb{R}^{Nd}$ are disjoint, then

$$\|\chi_{A\cup B}R\|_2^2=\operatorname{tr}[R^*\chi_{A\cup B}R]=\operatorname{tr}[R^*\chi_AR]+\operatorname{tr}[R^*\chi_BR]=\|\chi_AR\|_2^2+\|\chi_BR\|_2^2,\tag{11-1}$$

$$\|R\chi_{A\cup B}\|_2^2=\|\chi_{A\cup B}R^*\|_2^2=\|\chi_AR^*\|_2^2+\|\chi_BR^*\|_2^2=\|R\chi_A\|_2^2+\|R\chi_B\|_2^2.\tag{11-2}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $k \geq k_0$ be sufficiently large so that Lemma 11.2 holds for $j \geq k$. Given $s > 0$ and a bounded Borel f put $f_I := f\chi_I$ and $H_\omega := H^{(N)}(\omega)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\|\chi_{F_k} X^{s/2} f_I(H_\omega)\chi_K\|_2^2 &\leq c_1\|f\|_\infty^2 L_k^s \|E_\omega(I)\chi_K\|_2^2 \\ &\leq c_1\|f\|_\infty^2 L_k^s \|\chi_K T\|^2 \|E_\omega(I)T^{-1}\|_2^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|E_\omega(I)T^{-1}\|_2^2 = \nu_\omega(I) \leq C_{\mathrm{tr}}$ by (9-1), we get

$$\mathbb{E}\Big\{\sup_{\|f\|\leq 1} \|\chi_{F_k} X^{s/2} f_I(H_\omega)\chi_K\|_2^2\Big\} \leq c_2 L_k^{s+\gamma} < \infty.$$

Now $\chi_{M_j} X^{s/2} g = X^{s/2}\chi_{M_j} g$ for $g \in D(X^{s/2})$, so using (11-1) and (11-2),

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\Big\{\sum_{j\geq k}\sup_{\|f\|\leq 1} \|\chi_{M_j} X^{s/2} f_I(H_\omega)\chi_K\|_2^2\Big\} \\ &\qquad\leq \sum_{j\geq k} c_3 L_{j+1}^s \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\tilde{M}_j,\mathbf{y}\in\mathbf{B}^{(N)}_{r_N,L_{k_0}}(\mathbf{0})} \mathbb{E}\Big\{\sup_{\|f\|\leq 1}\|\chi_{\mathbf{x}} f_I(H_\omega)\chi_{\mathbf{y}}\|_2^2\Big\}\end{aligned}$$

Estimating $|\tilde{M}_j| \leq cL_{j+1}^{Nd}$, $|\mathbf{B}^{(N)}_{r_N,L_{k_0}}| \leq c' L_{k_0}^{Nd}$ and using Lemma 11.2, the series converges. Since $F_k \cup_{j\geq k} M_j = \mathbb{R}^{Nd}$, the theorem follows from (11-1). □

12. APPENDIX

Proof of Theorem 2.1. As a direct sum of Hilbert spaces, the space

$$\Big(\bigoplus_{\kappa\in\mathcal{K}} W^{1,2}((0,1)^n), \|\cdot\|_{W^{1,2}(\Gamma)}\Big), \qquad \|f\|_{W^{1,2}(\Gamma)}^2 := \sum_{\kappa\in\mathcal{K}} \|f_\kappa\|_{W^{1,2}((0,1)^n)}^2$$

is a Hilbert space. It follows from the trace theorem for $W^{1,2}((0,1)^n)$ (see e.g. [28, Theorem 1.1.2]) that $\big(W^{1,2}(\Gamma), \|\cdot\|_{W^{1,2}(\Gamma)}\big)$ is a closed subspace of $\big(\oplus_\kappa W^{1,2}((0,1)^n), \|\cdot\|_{W^{1,2}(\Gamma)}\big)$, hence a Hilbert space. Finally $\mathfrak{h}^\omega \geq nq_-$ and

$$\mathfrak{h}^\omega[f] \geq \|f\|_{W^{1,2}(\Gamma)}^2 + (nq_- - 1)\|f\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2$$

for any $f \in D(\mathfrak{h}^\omega)$, hence $\mathfrak{h}^\omega$ is bounded below and closed.

Let $C_c^\infty(\Gamma) := (\oplus_\kappa C_c^\infty(0,1)^n) \cap C_c(\Gamma)$. Since $D(\mathfrak{h}^\omega) \supset C_c^\infty(\Gamma)$, $\mathfrak{h}^\omega$ is densely defined. By [37, Theorem 4.1.5], the associated operator $H^{(n)}(\omega)$ is given by

$$D(H^{(n)}(\omega)) = \{f \in D(\mathfrak{h}^\omega) \,|\, \exists g \in \mathcal{H} : \forall v \in D(\mathfrak{h}^\omega),\ \mathfrak{h}^\omega[f,v] = \langle g, v\rangle\},$$

$$H^{(n)}(\omega)f := g.$$

So let $f \in D(H^{(n)}(\omega))$. Then in particular, given $v \in C_c^\infty(\Gamma)$, we have

$$\langle \nabla f, \nabla v\rangle = \langle g - V^\omega f, v\rangle.$$

Hence $-\Delta f = g - V^\omega f$ in the sense of distributions. As $g, V^\omega f \in L^2(\Gamma)$ and as $C_c^\infty(\Gamma)$ is dense in $L^2(\Gamma)$, the equality holds in the L^2 sense. Hence $H^{(n)}(\omega)f = g = -\Delta f + V^\omega f$. □

Proof of Lemma 3.1. For $d = 1$, it is obvious that $\#\{\mathcal{E}(\Gamma^{(1)} \cap \Lambda_L^{(1)})\} = 2L$ since in this case $\Lambda_L^{(1)}$ is just an open segment of length $2L$ and each edge has length 1.

So let us suppose the estimate is true for $d = m$ and calculate the number of edges in a 1-cube in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$, with coordinate axes $x_1, \ldots, x_{m+1}$. Since this number is invariant by translations, we may suppose the cube is $\Lambda_L^{(1)}(0)$. By hypothesis, the hyperplane $\{x_{m+1} =$

$L-1\} \cap \Lambda_L^{(1)}(0)$ contains $m(2L)(2L-1)^{m-1}$ edges. The same holds for the hyperplane $\{x_{m+1} = L-2\} \cap \Lambda_L^{(1)}(0)$ and so on, by calculating the number of edges in the hyperplanes $x_{m+1} = L-1, L-2, \dots, -L+1$, we obtain $(2L-1)(m(2L)(2L-1)^{m-1}) = m(2L)(2L-1)^m$ edges. It remains to calculate the number of "vertical" edges, i.e. edges that lie in the translates of the axis x_{m+1} in $\Lambda_L^{(1)}(0)$. There are $(2L-1)^m$ such translates (since each x_j, $j = 1, \dots, m$ varies from $L-1$ to $-L+1$), and each axis contains $2L$ edges by the case $d = 1$. Hence we get $(2L-1)^m(2L)$ vertical edges. The total number of edges is thus $m(2L)(2L-1)^m + (2L-1)^m(2L) = (m+1)(2L)(2L-1)^m$. Thus $(\mathsf{NB}.1)$ holds $\forall d \geq 1$.

Since $\Gamma^{(n)} = \Gamma^{(1)} \times \ldots \times \Gamma^{(1)}$, $(\mathsf{NB}.n)$ follows directly from $(\mathsf{NB}.1)$. □

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Divide the m cubes $\Lambda_{L+7}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}_{(j)})$ into m' connected components with $1 \leq m' \leq m$ and order them. If the kth component contains n_k cubes, find a cube Λ'_{l_k} containing it with $l_k := n_k(L+7)$. If these m' cubes are disjoint, then we are done. If not, divide them into m'' connected components and again find cubes Λ''_{l_k} around each component with $l_k = n_k(L+7)$, where n_k is the number of the original cubes $\Lambda_{L+7}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}_{(j)})$ which this component contains. Repeating this procedure we finally obtain the assertion. □

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Since $U \geq 0$, we have $V_\kappa^\omega = U + W_\kappa^\omega \geq nq_-$, thus $H^{(n)} \geq nq_-$ and $\sigma(H^{(n)}(\omega)) \subseteq [nq_{,} +\infty)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. To prove that $\sigma(H^{(n)}(\omega)) \supset [nq_-, nq_+]$ almost surely, let $E \in [nq_-, nq_+]$, put $I_m = [\frac{E}{n} - \frac{E-nq_-}{nm}, \frac{E}{n} + \frac{nq_+-E}{nm}] \subset [q_-, q_+]$ and let

$$B_m := \big\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd} : \min_{i \neq j} |x_i - x_j| \geq 2(m+1) + r_0\big\},$$

where r_0 is the interaction range of U. For $\mathbf{x} \in B_m$ consider the event

$$\Omega_m(\mathbf{x}) := \big\{\omega \in \Omega : \omega_{e_1}, \dots, \omega_{e_n} \in I_m \quad \forall e_j \in \mathcal{E}\big(\Gamma^{(1)} \cap \Lambda_{m+1}^{(1)}(x_j)\big)\big\}.$$

Note that if $\omega \in \Omega_m(\mathbf{x})$, then $W_\kappa^\omega \in [E - \frac{E-nq_-}{m}, E + \frac{nq_+-E}{m}]$ for all $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_{m+1}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}))$. Now $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_m(\mathbf{x})) = \mu(I_m)^{\#\{\mathcal{E}(\Gamma^{(1)} \cap \Lambda_{m+1}^{(1)})\}^n}$ is the same for all $\mathbf{x} \in B_m$ and it is strictly positive since $\operatorname{supp}\mu = [q_-, q_+]$. Also, for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in B_m$ verifying $\Pi\Lambda_{m+1}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi\Lambda_{m+1}^{(n)}(\mathbf{y}) = \emptyset$, the events $\Omega_m(\mathbf{x})$ and $\Omega_m(\mathbf{y})$ are independent. Hence, summing $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_m(\mathbf{x}))$ for infinitely many $\mathbf{x} \in B_m$ verifying that the corresponding cubes $\Lambda_{m+1}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$ are completely separated, we obtain an infinite value. By Borel-Cantelli lemma II, we thus get

$$\mathbb{P}\{\exists\, \mathbf{x} \in B_m : \Omega_m(\mathbf{x}) \text{ occurs}\} = 1.$$

Thus for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, $\exists \mathbf{x}_m(\omega) \in B_m$ such that $\omega \in \Omega_m(\mathbf{x}_m(\omega))$. We finally construct a Weyl sequence: for fixed m, choose $f_m \in D(H^{(n)})$ such that $\|f_m\| = 1$, $0 \leq f_m \leq c_m$ for some constant c_m, $f_m = c_m$ on $\Gamma \cap \Lambda_m^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}_m(\omega))$, $f_m = 0$ on $\Gamma \cap \Lambda_{m+1}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}_m(\omega))^c$, $\|\nabla f_m\|_\infty \leq Cc_m$ and $\|\Delta f_m\|_\infty \leq Cc_m$. Now for $\omega \in \Omega_m(\mathbf{x}_m(\omega))$,

$$\|(H^{(n)}(\omega) - E)f_m\| = \|\chi_{\Lambda_{m+1}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}_m(\omega))}(-\Delta + U + W^\omega - E)f_m\|.$$

But $\mathbf{x}_m(\omega) \in B_m$, so $U = 0$ on $\Lambda_{m+1}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}_m(\omega))$. Also $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_{m+1}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}_m(\omega)))$ implies $|W_\kappa^\omega - E| \leq \frac{c}{m}$. Thus

$$\|(H^{(n)} - E)f_m\| = \|\chi_{\Lambda_{m+1}^{(n)}}(-\Delta + W^\omega - E)f_m\| \leq \|\Delta f_m\| + \frac{c}{m}\|f_m\| \to 0.$$

Indeed, note that

$$1 = \|f_m\|^2 \geq \|\chi_{\Lambda_m^{(n)}} f_m\|^2 = c_m^2(\#\{\mathcal{K}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_m^{(n)})\}),$$

hence $c_m^2 \leq (\#\{\mathcal{K}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_m^{(n)})\})^{-1}$ and using (NB.n),

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta f_m\|^2 = \|\chi_{\Lambda_{m+1}^{(n)} \setminus \Lambda_m^{(n)}} \Delta f_m\|^2 &\leq \|\Delta f_m\|_\infty^2 \left(\#\{\mathcal{K}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_{m+1}^{(n)})\} - \#\{\mathcal{K}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_m^{(n)})\}\right) \\ &\leq C^2 \frac{(2m+2)^n (2m+1)^{nd-n} - (2m)^n (2m-1)^{nd-n}}{(2m)^n (2m-1)^{nd-n}} \xrightarrow[m\to\infty]{} 0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence $E \in \sigma(H^{(n)}(\omega))$ almost surely. We thus get the assertion. □

Proof of Lemma 3.4. We first note that

$$H_\Lambda^{(n)}(\omega) \geq -\Delta_\Lambda^N + nq_- \geq -\Delta_\Lambda^{N,\,\mathrm{dec}} + nq_- \qquad (\star)$$

Since $\Delta_\Lambda^{N,\,\mathrm{dec}} = \oplus_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda^{(n)})} \Delta_{(0,1)^n}^N$, the eigenvalues $E_j(-\Delta_\Lambda^{N,\,\mathrm{dec}})$ are just the eigenvalues $E_k(-\Delta_{(0,1)^n}^N)$ with multiplicity $\#\{\mathcal{K}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda^{(n)})\} \leq d^n |\Lambda^{(n)}|$. In particular, $E_j(-\Delta_\Lambda^{N,\,\mathrm{dec}}) \to \infty$ as $j \to \infty$, so by $(\star)$ and [36, Theorem XIII.64], $H_\Lambda^{(n)}$ has a compact resolvent and thus a discrete spectrum. Now by Weyl law for $E_k(-\Delta_{(0,1)^n}^N)$ ([36, XIII.15]), there exists C_1 such that $k > C_1 \implies E_k(-\Delta_{(0,1)^n}^N) > S - nq_-$, and if S is large, $C_1 \approx \frac{(S-nq_-)^{n/2}}{(4\pi)^{n/2}\Gamma(n/2)}$. Thus $j > C_1 d^n |\Lambda^{(n)}| \implies E_j(-\Delta_\Lambda^{N,\,\mathrm{dec}}) > S - nq_-$. But by $(\star)$, $E_j(H_\Lambda^{(n)}(\omega)) \geq E_j(-\Delta_\Lambda^{N,\,\mathrm{dec}}) + nq_-$. Thus $j > d^n C_1 |\Lambda^{(n)}| \implies E_j(H_\Lambda^{(n)}(\omega)) > S$. We get (WEYL.$n$) with $C = d^n C_1$. □

Proof of Lemma 3.5. Suppose $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is not decomposable. Then $\exists\, i \neq 1$ such that $|u_1 - u_i| < 2L + r_0$ (otherwise $\mathcal{J} = \{1\}$ would give a possible partition). Let $\mathcal{J}_2 = \{1, i\}$. Since $\mathcal{J}_2$ is not a possible partition, $\exists\, i_2 \notin \mathcal{J}_2$ such that $|u_1 - u_{i_2}| < 2L + r_0$ or $|u_i - u_{i_2}| < 2L + r_0$. Taking $\mathcal{J}_3 = \{1, i, i_2\}$, the set $\{u_k : k \in \mathcal{J}_3\}$ is thus $(L + r_0/2)$-connected. As $\mathcal{J}_3$ is not a possible partition, we may repeat the procedure and finally obtain $\mathcal{J}_n = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $\{u_k : k \in \mathcal{J}_n\}$ is $(L + r_0/2)$-connected. Consequently,

$$\forall 1 \leq j \leq n : |u_j - u_1| < (n-1)(2L + r_0)$$

Hence

$$\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbb{D}) \leq |\mathbf{u} - (u_1, \ldots, u_1)| = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |u_j - u_1| < (n-1)(2L + r_0)$$

The lemma now results by contraposition. □

Proof of Lemma 3.6. 1) Decompose $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ into maximal L-connected subsets

$$\mathcal{P}_k = \{y_j : j \in \mathcal{J}_k\}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, m,$$

and let $\mathcal{Z}_k = \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{J}_k} \Lambda_L^{(1)}(y_j)$. Then $(\mathcal{Z}_k)_k$ form a partition of $\Pi\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{y})$. Suppose now that $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{y})$ are not separable. Then

$$\forall \emptyset \neq \mathcal{J} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\} : \Pi_{\mathcal{J}} \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{y}) \cap \left(\Pi_{\mathcal{J}^c} \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{y}) \cup \Pi\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})\right) \neq \emptyset$$

Since $(\mathcal{Z}_k)$ form a partition of $\Pi\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{y})$, we have in particular

$$\forall\, 1 \leq k \leq m : \mathcal{Z}_k \cap \Pi\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \emptyset,$$

hence

$$\forall\, 1 \le k \le m, \exists\, y_j \in \mathcal{P}_k, \exists\, x_i : |y_j - x_i| < 2L.$$

But $\mathcal{P}_k$ are L-connected, hence $\forall i, j \in \mathcal{J}_k : |y_i - y_j| < 2(n-1)L$. Thus,

$$\forall\, y_j\ \exists\, x_i : |y_j - x_i| < 2nL,$$

so that $\mathbf{y} \in \Lambda^{(n)}_{2nL}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})$ for some k. The claim follows by contraposition.

2) This follows from 1) by noting that $r_{n,L} \ge 2nL$ and that $|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}^{(j)}| \ge r_{n,L}$ for all j implies $|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}| \ge r_{n,L}$ (since $\mathbf{x}$ is one of the $\mathbf{x}^{(j)}$).
3) This follows from 2) by noting that $\mathbf{0}^{(j)} = \mathbf{0}$ for all j.
4) Let

$$F = \bigcup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda^{(n)}_{r_{n,L}}(\mathbf{0})} \ \bigcup_{j=1}^{K(n)} \Lambda^{(n)}_{r_{n,L}}(\mathbf{x}^{(j)}).$$

Then by 2), if $\mathbf{y} \notin F$, then $\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{y})$ is distant from any $\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{x})$ with $\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda^{(n)}_{r_{n,L}}(\mathbf{0})$. Thus it suffices to show that $\Lambda^{(n)}_{2r_{n,L}}(\mathbf{0}) = F$. For this note that if $\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda^{(n)}_{r_{n,L}}(\mathbf{0})$, then $|x_k| < r_{n,L}$ for all k, so by definition of $\mathbf{x}^{(j)}$, $|\mathbf{x}^{(j)}| < r_{n,L}$ for all j and so $\mathbf{x}^{(j)} \in \Lambda^{(n)}_{r_{n,L}}(\mathbf{0})$ for all j. Thus $F = \bigcup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda^{(n)}_{r_{n,L}}(\mathbf{0})} \Lambda^{(n)}_{r_{n,L}}(\mathbf{x}) = \Lambda^{(n)}_{2r_{n,L}}(\mathbf{0})$. □

Proof of Lemma 3.7. Since $\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{u})$ and $\Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{v})$ are FI, there exists $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}| < (n-1)(2L + r_0)$ and $|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{y}| < (n-1)(2L + r_0)$. Hence for all $j, k = 1, \dots, n$:

$$(\star) \qquad \Pi_j \Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{u}) \subseteq \Pi_j \Lambda^{(n)}_{(n-1)(2L+r_0)+L}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_k \Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{v}) \subseteq \Pi_k \Lambda^{(n)}_{(n-1)(2L+r_0)+L}(\mathbf{y}).$$

Now

$$|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}| \le |\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}| + |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| + |\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{v}| < 2(n-1)(2L + r_0) + |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|.$$

Since $|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}| \ge r_{n,L} = 4(n-1)(2L + r_0) + 2L$, we get

$$|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| > |\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}| - 2(n-1)(2L + r_0) \ge 2(n-1)(2L + r_0) + 2L.$$

Since $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{D}$, this implies

$$(\star\star) \qquad \Pi_j \Lambda^{(n)}_{(n-1)(2L+r_0)+L}(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi_k \Lambda^{(n)}_{(n-1)(2L+r_0)+L}(\mathbf{y}) = \emptyset$$

for all $j, k = 1, \dots, n$. By $(\star)$ and $(\star\star)$, we see that $\Pi_j \Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{u}) \cap \Pi_k \Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{v}) = \emptyset$ for all j, k. Hence $\Pi \Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{u}) \cap \Pi \Lambda^{(n)}_L(\mathbf{v}) = \emptyset$, as asserted. □

Acknowledgements. This work is part of my PhD thesis, supervised by Professors Anne Boutet de Monvel and Victor Chulaevsky. I would like to express here my gratitude for their patience and their numerous suggestions, which led to significant improvements to the results presented here.

References

[1] M. Abramowitz, and I.A. Stegun *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, Dover, 1965.

[2] M. Aizenman, R. Sims, and S. Warzel, *Absolutely continuous spectra of quantum tree graphs with weak disorder*, Commun. Math. Phys. **264** (2006), 371–389.

[3] C. Băcuţă, A.L. Mazzucato, V. Nistor and L. Zikatanov, *Interface and mixed boundary value problems on n-dimensional polyhedral domains*, Doc. Math. **15** (2010), 687–745.

[4] Y. M. Berezansky, Z. G. Sheftel and G. F. Us *Functional Analysis, Vol. II*, Operator Theory Advances and Applications, vol. 86, Birkhäuser, 1996.

[5] J. Bolte, and J. Kerner, *Quantum graphs with singular two-particle interactions.* (preprint arXiv: 1112.4751v1)

[6] A. Boutet de Monvel, V. Chulaevsky, and Y. Suhov, *Dynamical localization for a multi-particle model with an alloy-type external random potential*, Nonlinearity **24** (2011), 1451–1472.

[7] A. Boutet de Monvel and P. Stollmann, *Eigenfunction expansions for generators of Dirichlet forms*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **561** (2003), no. 561, 131–144.

[8] V. Chulaevsky and Y. Suhov, *Wegner Bounds for a Two-Particle Tight Binding Model*, Commun. Math. Phys. **283** (2008), 479–489

[9] ———, *Multi-particle Anderson Localisation: Induction on the Number of Particles*, Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. **12** (2009), 117–139.

[10] T. Coulhon and A. Sikora, *Gaussian heat kernel upper bounds via the Phragmén-Lindelöf theorem*, Proc.London Math. Soc. **96** (2008), 507–544.

[11] H. von Dreifus and A. Klein, *A New Proof of Localization in the Anderson Tight Binding Model*, Commun. Math. Phys. **124** (1989), 285–299.

[12] P. Exner, M. Helm, and P. Stollmann, *Localization on a Quantum Graph with Random Potential on the Edges*, Rev. Math. Phys. **19** (2007), 923–939.

[13] W. Fischer, H. Leschke, and P. Müller, *Spectral Localization by Gaussian Random Potentials in Multi-Dimensional Continuous space*, J. Statist. Phys. **101** (2000), 935–985.

[14] J. Fröhlich and T. Spencer, *Absence of diffusion in the Anderson tight binding model for large disorder or low energy*, Commun. Math. Phys. **88** (1983), 151–184.

[15] F. Germinet and A. Klein, *Bootstrap Multiscale Analysis and Localization in Random Media*, Commun. Math. Phys. **222** (2001), 415–448.

[16] I.S. Gradshteyn, and I.M. Ryzhik *Table of Integrals, Series and Products*, seventh edition, Elsevier, 2007.

[17] P. Grisvard, *Elliptic Problems in Nonsmooth Domains*, Monographs and Studies in Mathematics, vol. 24, Pitnam (Advanced Publishing Program), 1985.

[18] M. Gruber, D. Lenz and I. Veselić, *Uniform existence of the integrated density of states for random Schrödinger operators on metric graphs over* $\mathbb{Z}^d$, J. Funct. Anal. **253** (2007), 515–533.

[19] P. Hislop and O. Post, *Anderson localization for radial tree-like quantum graphs*, Waves Random Complex Media **19** (2009), 216–261.

[20] M. Helm and I. Veselić, *Linear Wegner estimate for alloy-type Schrödinger operators on metric graphs*, J. Math. Phys. **48** (2007).

[21] A. Klein, A. Koines and M. Seifert, *Generalized Eigenfunctions for Waves in Inhomogeneous Media*, J. Funct. Anal. **190** (2002), 255–291.

[22] F. Klopp and K. Pankrashkin, *Localization on Quantum Graphs with Random Vertex Couplings*, J. Statist. Phys. **131** (2008), 651–673.

[23] ———, *Localization on Quantum Graphs with Random Edge Lengths*, Lett. Math. Phys. **87** (2009), 99–114,

[24] P. Kuchment, *Quantum graphs I. Some basic structures*, Waves Random Media **14** (2004), no. 1, S107–S128.

[25] J. Lindenstrauss and A. Pełczyński, *Absolutely summing operators in $\mathcal{L}_p$-spaces and their applications*, Studia Math. **29** (1968), 275–326.

[26] V. Maz'ya, *Sobolev Spaces: with Applications to Elliptic Partial Differential Equations*, second ed., Springer, 2011.

[27] F. Mehmeti, J. Von Below, and S. Nicaise, *Partial Differential Equations on Multistructures*, CRC Press, 2001.

[28] J. Nečas, *Direct Methods in the Theory of Elliptic Equations*, SMM, Springer, 2012.

[29] S. Nicaise, *Spectre des réseaux topologiques finis*, Bull. Sci. Math. (2) **111** (1987), no. 4, 401–413.

[30] ———, *Polygonal Interface Problems*, Peter Lang, 1993.

[31] E.M. Ouhabaz, *Analysis of Heat Equations on Domains*, LMS Monograph Series, Vol. 31, Princeton University Press, 2005.

[32] Yu. V. Pokornyi and A. V. Borovskikh, *Differential equations on networks (geometric graphs)*, J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.) **119** (2004), no. 6, 691–718.

[33] T. Poerschke, G. Stolz and J. Weidmann *Expansions in Generalized Eigenfunctions of Selfadjoint Operators*, Math. Z. **202** (1989), 397–408.

[34] O. Post, *Spectral analysis of metric graphs and related spaces*, Limits of graphs in group theory and computer science, EPFL Press, Lausanne, 2009, pp. 109–140.

[35] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics I: Functional Analysis*, Academic Press, New York, 1980.

[36] ———, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics IV: Analysis of Operators*, Academic Press, New York, 1978.

[37] P. Stollmann, *Caught by Disorder: Bound States in Random Media*, Progress in Mathematical Physics, vol. 20, Birkhäuser, 2001.

[38] ———, *Wegner estimates and localization for continuum Anderson models with some singular distributions*, Arch. Math. **75** (2000), 307–311.

Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu, Université Paris Diderot Paris 7, 175 rue du Chevaleret, 75013, Paris, France

E-mail address: `sabri@math.jussieu.fr`